

THE MONTH

A CATHOLIC MAGAZINE



NO. 519 (NEW SERIES 129) SEPT., 1907

CONTENTS

THE REVISION OF THE VULGATE. I....	<i>By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith</i>	225
MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS AND THE BABINGTON PLOT.		
II. The Second Act.....	<i>By the Rev. J. H. Pollen</i>	240
THE "BAPTISM" OF BELLS.....	<i>By the Rev. Herbert Thurston</i>	254
THE SOCIETY OF JESUS AND EDUCATION. VI. In the face of our times.....	<i>By the Rev. Alban Goodier</i>	270
CATHOLICS AND THE PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN....	<i>By I. C. Scoles</i>	285
GATHERED BY THE WAY.....	<i>By the Rev. H. S. Squirrell</i>	297
FAITH IN BEING.....	<i>By R. H. J. Steuart</i>	300
WILLIAM GIFFORD.....	<i>By P. A. Sillard</i>	309
FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.....		317
"Probabilism."		
A Lover of Truth.		
REVIEWS		324
SHORT NOTICES		332
MAGAZINES		335

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO
LONDON & ONE SHILLING

STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES.

PSYCHOLOGY:

Empirical and Rational.

BY

MICHAEL MAHER, S.J., D.Lit.; M.A. LOND.

SIXTH EDITION.

(FOURTEENTH TO SEVENTEENTH THOUSAND.)

PRICE 6s. 6d.

1. **Logic.** By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J., formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford. Second Edition. Price 5s.
 2. **First Principles of Knowledge.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J., late Professor of Logic and General Metaphysics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Third Edition. Price 5s.
 3. **Moral Philosophy (Ethics and Natural Law).** By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J., M.A. Lond.; late Professor of Ethics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Third Edition. Price 5s.
 4. **Natural Theology.** By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J., Professor of Natural Theology at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Second Edition. Price 6s. 6d.
 6. **General Metaphysics.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Second Edition. Price 5s.
 7. **Political Economy.** By CHARLES S. DEVAS, M.A. Oxon. Sometime Examiner in Political Economy at the Royal University of Ireland. Third Edition. Revised and Enlarged. (Seventh to Ninth Thousand). Price 7s. 6d.
-

LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co., London, New York, and Bombay.



The Revision of the Vulgate.

I.

THE publication of Cardinal Rampolla's letter to the Arch-Abbot of the Benedictine Order has drawn attention to the Vulgate version of the Bible, and has caused people to ask after the nature of its authority in the Catholic Church and the nature of the revision it requires. The object of the present article is the humble one of meeting these demands, and not of discussing the more subtle problems of the revision process.

Presently we shall have to say more exactly what is the nature of the Vulgate version; for the moment it is sufficient to say that it is the Latin translation of the Old and New Testaments, which has been in use in the Catholic Church for considerably more than a thousand years. At the time of the Renaissance other Latin translations were attempted by scholars both Catholic and Protestant, of whom the chief were, on the Catholic side, Erasmus, Rudelius, Steuchus, Isidorus Clarius, Sanctes Pagninus, Cajetanus, and on the Protestant, Osiander, Pellicanus, Sebastian Münster, and Sebastian Castellio. The result was to cause great confusion and uncertainty, especially as, in those days of heated and embittered controversy, translators were apt to twist into a sense favourable to their own doctrinal position passages which lent themselves to the process. Accordingly, the Council of Trent took this matter into serious consideration, and passed the following Decree:

The same holy Synod, considering that no small profit would accrue to the Church of God, if it were made known which of all the Latin versions of the Sacred Books that are in circulation is to be held as authentic, decrees and declares that this same ancient and Vulgate edition, which has been approved by its long-continued use through so many centuries in the same Church, is to be held for authentic in public lectures, disputations, sermons, and expositions, and that no one must dare or presume to reject it on any pretext whatever.

It is in virtue of this Decree that the Vulgate version has become the "authentic"—that is, the authorized—version of the Catholic Church. But in what sense is this to be understood? Not, as some non-Catholic writers have imagined, in the sense that the Council wished to set aside the Hebrew and Greek originals as of less value and even to be rejected where they happened to disagree with the readings of the Vulgate. The Fathers of Trent expressly say in their Decree that the question before them was as to which of the existing *Latin* versions they should single out for authorization; and they even debated whether they should not also authorize a Hebrew and Greek text. If they desisted from doing this latter, perhaps it was because on consideration they felt that the primary and practical purpose of an authorization by Church authority was to ensure that a suitable text should be employed for reading in church or using in the public discussions which it was the custom to hold in the Universities and Schools; and that, this being so, the text selected needed to be in the language in common use on such occasions. The Anglicans have similarly authorized a particular text, and it never occurred to them to select one in the Hebrew or Greek language. They selected one in English, as English was the language of their church services and public readings. And so the Catholic Church using Latin on these public occasions authorized a Latin text and no other.

Nor did the Council of Trent intend by its Decree to assert the absolute accuracy in all particulars of the version it was authorizing, in other words, its absolute accordance in every passage with the original Hebrew and Greek texts, as they left the hands of the inspired writers. Apart from a few sixteenth century writers of minor authority, who had from the first many and more weighty experts against them, the rulers and theologians of the Church have never supposed the Decree of Trent to bear such a far-reaching and absurd meaning. It would then be irrational to ascribe to it that meaning, at all events unless it conveyed it in the plainest terms. Yet so far from doing this, it confines itself to a bare declaration that "this ancient and Vulgate edition is to be held for authentic." There is indeed a clause in the Decree which says that "no one is to dare or presume to reject this edition on any pretext," and some have claimed that this must mean that no one is allowed to reject any of its readings on the score that they differ from

what must be held to be the pure text of the original. But "rejecting" here means rejecting as doctrinally unsound, not as textually inaccurate. The controversies about which the disputants of those days were solicitous were controversies as to what doctrines were true or false, and the Council's point is that, if the words of any Vulgate passage properly interpreted yield a certain statement of any point of controverted doctrine, the proof must be accepted by all Catholics as decisive in favour of that doctrine. For instance, the reading of 1 St. John v. 7, "There are three that bear witness in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one," was most probably, not to say certainly, interpolated into the Vulgate, perhaps from a marginal comment in the copy, at a very early date. But being in the Vulgate edition, the doctrine of the Trinity which the clause affirms may, on this ground alone, according to the Decree of Trent, be safely taken as a genuine doctrine of the Christian revelation. Several considerations show that this was what the Fathers of Trent intended. In the first place the wording of the Decree points this way. The Vulgate is declared to be authentic on the ground that "it has been approved by its long-continued use through so many centuries in the same Church." As an argument for its textual exactness this argument from long-continued use is of no value whatever; as an argument for the doctrinal soundness of all its contents it is decisive—for it would be inconsistent with the indefectibility of the Church for God to allow it to be misled by textual error into false doctrine during all that long period. The false doctrine would have been surely scented and the spuriousness of the reading conjectured. In the second place, persons present at the Council have left on record their testimony that the Council meant just this and no more. The words of several could be adduced for this purpose, but those of Vega, a consulting theologian of the Council, whose opinions carried great weight with its members, will suffice.

Do not be in error, Calvin, as to the approbation of the Vulgate, but listen to a thing or two which I should like also to say to Philip [Melancthon], who preceded you in bringing a grave charge against the Fathers on this account. The Council did not approve the [textual] errors which persons skilled in languages, and even moderately versed in the Holy Scriptures, discover in it. For [the Council] did not wish it to be adored as a thing that had come down from Heaven. It knew that the translator who made it, whoever he may have been, was not a

prophet, and that we have not merited to have any one to translate the Holy Scriptures from their original and native language into another under the same Holy Spirit [in which they were written]. Wherefore [the Council] does not restrain and never wished to restrain the industry of students of languages who sometimes teach that certain passages could have been better rendered, or that by one and the same word the Holy Spirit suggested several senses, or more suitable senses than can be obtained from the Vulgate version. But in respect for its antiquity, and for the honour shown it by the Latin Councils which have used it for many years past; and that the faithful might know what is most true, namely, that no pernicious error can be found in it, and that it can be read safely and without risk; moreover, also, to restrain the confusion caused by a multitude of translations, and to check the excessive liberty to make new translations, [the Council] wisely decreed that we must use this one in public lectures, disputations, and expositions. And to this extent only did it desire that it should be held for authentic, that it might be certain to all that it was tainted by no error from which any pernicious dogma in faith or morals could be deduced; and therefore it decreed that no one must under any pretext presume to reject it.

However, though it would be unwarrantable to credit the Decree of Trent with wishing to affirm the absolute conformity of the Vulgate with the autographs of the inspired writers, it must be held to have affirmed the substantial fidelity of this version; for it would have been irrational to give the sanction of authority to a text which fell short of that standard of perfection. But this was a responsibility which the Fathers of Trent could easily have accepted, even had they no supernatural guidance to count upon. When we compare together the Hebrew and Greek originals, and all the ancient versions of these originals, Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, Coptic, Gothic, &c., together with the respective variants of each of them, we find that, though the number of the variants runs into hundreds of thousands, in all but a thousand or two it is perfectly clear which is the correct reading, and of this thousand or two very few indeed materially affect the sense. What this means is that the variants, though in a sense defects, are not defects which deprive us of the true text to any serious extent, whilst, on the other hand, they are of invaluable service to us, since by their existence they prove the independence of the copyists among themselves, which being established, the marvellous agreement of these independent witnesses in other respects furnishes a convincing proof that all these ancient

versions, together with the original texts, as they have come down to us, have that substantial fidelity to the autographs which is an indispensable condition for authorization.

Still, a Decree of authorization should not be content with substantial fidelity, but aim at getting the best text within its reach. On what grounds then was it justifiable to recognize this kind of pre-eminence in the Vulgate? One answer, and that the primary one, has been already given; namely, that the Vulgate, by reason of its long use in the Church, could furnish a guarantee of orthodoxy to which no other Latin version could pretend. But even on purely textual grounds all scholars would agree that it stands high in the matter of correctness. It cannot indeed be regarded as altogether homogeneous in this respect, and in particular the defects of its text of the Psalter might be pointed out to us—where, however, we are confronted with an interesting problem which we shall consider in the article to follow. Meanwhile, speaking generally, it is very good, and if we keep in view the circumstances under which the Council of Trent had to decide, namely, that it had to decide between the Vulgate and the Latin translations then recently made, few would now-a-days be found to regret that one of the latter had not been preferred to it. For those translators, by making it the basis of their own versions, and departing from it so little, implicitly acknowledge its high value, whilst, by differing among themselves as they do when they presume to depart from it, they bear explicit witness to their own relative inferiority, an inferiority which is to be seen also in that very feature of those translations which the authors would have deemed to be their chief merit, namely, the character of their Latin style which, in seeking to be classical, lost the quality befitting a sacred book and became too secular.

The Vulgate version, however, at the time of the Council had shared the lot of other manuscript texts, through the errors introduced by the carelessness or sciolism of the copyists during so many centuries. Accordingly, the Fathers of Trent expressed the wish that the Holy See would cause it to be revised as perfectly as possible with the aid of the best manuscripts then procurable. This charge the Popes of that age willingly accepted, and the work was brought to a completion under Clement VIII. in 1592, when it was ordered that henceforth all publishers of Vulgate Bibles should reproduce none other save the text of the Clementine revision. It was a successful revision for those

days, but it was far from perfect as judged by the standards we can now recognize ; besides, it was not strictly adhered to by the subsequent printers, and is not accurately preserved (though the errors of this sort are of small importance) in the ordinary copies we now possess. Hence the desire for a further revision, in accordance with the critical principles and *apparatus* now at our disposal, a desire long felt and often expressed, and one which it may be our happiness at no distant date to see fulfilled. What has been entrusted to the Benedictine Order is the preliminary labour of collecting and collating the manuscripts, and of studying and applying the principles which should govern a revision. It is a labour which must needs be as heavy as it is honourable, and it has been most appropriately committed to that great Order. We speak familiarly of the text of the Bible having been preserved to us by the care and diligence of the monks. But that means that, mainly though not exclusively, it has been preserved to us by the Benedictines, for it was chiefly in their cloisters that the transcriptions took place, and in their libraries that the copies were kept, and they have always made it their speciality to study and elaborate the principles by which the variants should be judged and purity of text determined.

We propose to speak in another article more in detail about this revision process and the principles on which it will have to be carried through, but first it will be convenient to answer another query which the terms of the Tridentine Decree may suggest. If, it may be asked, the Fathers of Trent saw the desirability of having as correct as possible a Latin translation, why did they not have one made afresh from the Hebrew and Greek originals which were in their hands instead of recommending this roundabout and superfluous labour, of recovering the exact form of an ancient translation from these same languages? Why, at all events, if they must adhere to this ancient translation, did they not, like Erasmus, Osiander, and the other translators of their time, correct this ancient Latin text by the Hebrew and Greek texts in the places where it varied from them? This is a question which a scholar would not so readily put, but it is one which may very naturally occur to others. The answer is very simple. By what Hebrew or Greek texts should the Vulgate Latin be judged and corrected? The question tacitly assumes that the Hebrew and Greek texts which were accessible in those days had been preserved, by the

accident of their being in the language of the original writers, free from all the corrupting influences to which successive transcriptions had exposed them. But that is quite inadmissible. The texts of the original languages then extant, those at least which formed the type on which the printed editions were based, were for the Old Testament the Masoretic¹ edition of the Hebrew, and for the New what has been called, just because it was then commonly employed for reproduction, the *textus receptus* of the Greek. These furnish one variety of the original text, but one only. The Vulgate translation furnishes another, for it is possible to translate back from the Latin text to the Hebrew and Greek texts from which it was taken in the first instance, and so recover the latter with considerable accuracy. To decide which of these varieties of the Hebrew and Greek text is the best is for those who know how to apply sound principles of textual criticism, and it may be noted incidentally that, for the New Testament at all events, competent critics agree in preferring the Greek text preserved to us through the Vulgate to that called the *textus receptus*. Still we need not touch that point at present. What concerns us for the moment is that the fact of a form of the original text lying behind the text of the translation, and being recoverable through it, indicates the reasonableness of the procedure adopted by the Church in revising her authorized translation by manuscripts of its own family.

It is true there was a third course open to the Fathers of Trent, namely, to construct, by the application of scientific principles of textual criticism to the MSS. materials available, a Hebrew and Greek text of the greatest possible purity, and translate afresh from that. Why, it may be asked, was not this course preferred? But the reply is that (1) this is to require of

¹ Until about the second century of our era, it would appear that the text of the Old Testament existed in several varieties due to careless transcription, of the same kind as has affected the transmission of our Greek and Latin MSS. But from that time onwards most diligent efforts were made to fix the text, and an elaborate system for securing the absolute correctness of subsequent transcription was evolved, and this was brought to completion by the Masoretes (*i.e.*, Traditionalists), between the sixth and ninth centuries. It is their text which is called the Masoretic, and, in the opinion of Lagarde and others, it goes back to a single official MS. dating from the second century after Christ. Apparently after it had been fixed all divergent MSS. were either purposely destroyed or allowed to perish, which must be the reason why no Hebrew MSS. earlier than about the tenth century, or giving another variety of text, are now in existence.

the Catholic revisers of those days what no Protestant reviser thought of doing; (2) the course suggested is one which in those days could not have been done satisfactorily, and even in these days would be of questionable propriety. Such scientific texts have indeed their place in commentaries, or editions for the use of scholars, but they cannot redeem themselves from the reproach of subjectivism, are never safe from the criticism of other scholars, and can never flatter themselves with the promise of finality. It is better therefore even now, and was certainly much better then, to revise a good existing translation by MSS. of its own text, and leave disputed points to be discussed by the commentators; and especially did this consideration hold in the circumstances of the Tridentine Fathers, who were confronted with a version of such authority in the Church as the Vulgate. For consider what the authority of this version was and is: (1) It had been in use for so many centuries, indeed, in a sense, from the first Christian centuries—for even when translating from the Hebrew St. Jerome had been careful to retain the very words of the older version, so far as they accorded with his Hebrew MSS., whilst his New Testament was simply a revision of the text of that older version. (2) It was a translation which by reason of its age was above the suspicion of having been doctored—as so many of the contemporary versions were—to meet the exigencies of the prevailing controversies. (3) It was one of the most trustworthy witnesses to the ancient form of the original text, for in the Old Testament it represented a text which is not identical with the Masoretic recension, and as such is most valuable for comparison with it. (4) It was the only Bible that had been in general use in the Church, and as such it had attracted a veneration which was in itself a very precious possession. All the commentaries had been founded on it, all the Scriptural references and allusions in both ecclesiastical and secular writings had been to it and to no other. All the translations into the Western vernacular tongues, with the single exception of the Gothic translation of Ulphilas, had been made from it. Even the translations made by the Church's adversaries were either from it, as was that of Wicklif, or, like Luther's and the Anglican Authorized, were so largely influenced by it that they may justly be regarded as its offspring. And, lastly, the very speech of Europe, so far as it was of Latin origin, may be said to have been cast in its mould,

whilst the theological terminology was ultimately derived from it.¹

In the earliest period the Roman Christians appear to have been mainly of Greek extraction, and to have used the Greek language in their liturgy as in their common speech. It does not seem likely therefore that they needed a Latin version of the Scriptures, and it was probably in the Province of Africa that such a version was first made. Anyhow, it is certain that it was made, as St. Augustine expresses it, *a primis temporibus fidei*. It was a translation from the LXX. for the Old Testament, and from the original Greek for the New. It has been much disputed, nor is the dispute yet settled entirely, as to whether there was one such translation or many. We need not concern ourselves with that point now. At least by the time of Tertullian—that is, by the last quarter of the second century—some one version had attained to a definite form, which was characterized by its extreme and even slavish adherence to the very letter of the Greek, a literality extending even to the reproduction of Greek idioms and constructions which in Latin were hardly intelligible. Later, when the substitution of Latin for Greek had been effected among the Roman, and perhaps the Italian Christians, this existing Latin version was adopted, though with a certain softening down of its harsh style and correction of its excessive Graecisms. And it was apparently the version thus revised which St. Augustine had in mind when he wrote that “among the versions [or recensions] the *Itala* is to be preferred as adhering the most tenaciously to the words [of the original] and being at the same time the clearest in its renderings.” But this *Itala*, though in its general character answering to this description, had by the time of St. Jerome and St. Augustine been corrupted by the usual errors of transcription, especially by those due to the tendency of transcribers to correct from other manuscripts, without reference to genealogy, the readings of the manuscript they were copying. Thus the want of a good revision was sorely felt, but fortunately, to use the words of the late Bishop Westcott, “In the crisis of danger the great scholar was raised up who probably alone for fifteen hundred years possessed the qualifications necessary for producing an original version of the Scriptures for the use of the Latin Churches.” This was St. Jerome, who, on the invitation

¹ See on this point Bishop Westcott's article on “The Vulgate,” in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*.

of Pope St. Damasus, undertook this work, and devoted twenty years of his life to its accomplishment. His first thought was merely to revise the current Latin text of the New Testament by the best Greek MSS. he had been able to find and collate, correcting only when the sense required it; and he began with the four Gospels. This he did in 383. Whether he also revised similarly the remainder of the New Testament has been questioned, but that he did seems proved by internal evidence and indeed by his own words, though possibly he did not consider that as much revision was required there as in the Gospels. Corruption, it must be remembered, was a pest to which those parts of Scripture were most exposed which being most often used were most often transcribed. In the same year in which he revised the Gospels, he also revised the old Latin Psalter into a closer accordance with the Septuagint, but as he himself tells us, he revised it hastily and (only) to a large extent (*cursim et magna ex parte*). This work was done at Rome, but on returning finally to the Holy Land in 384, he found in the library at Caesarea the original of Origen's *Hexaplar*, and from this more accurate Greek text of the Old Testament, he made a further and more complete revision of the old Latin Psalter. Thus we have from his pen two revisions of the ancient translation from the LXX., one which came to be called the Roman, and was used in the churches of Rome and Italy until the time of Pius V., who restricted its use thenceforth to the Basilica of St. Peter at Rome, and the Cathedral Churches of St. Ambrose at Milan, and St. Mark at Venice; and the Gallican, so called because through the influence of St. Gregory of Tours it came into general use in Gaul much earlier than elsewhere, and this, as being more correct, the same Pontiff caused to be in general use elsewhere; as it still is. St. Jerome also revised from the Greek of Origen's *Hexaplar* the books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, and Paralipomena, as we know from his Prefaces to these books; and apparently also the other books of the Old Testament, though this is not absolutely certain—as, with the exception of his Psalter and the Book of Job, the rest of this revision was lost. But the more he advanced in this work of revising and expurgating a version already in use, the more he became convinced of the desirability of a fresh translation in the case of the Old Testament from the original Hebrew, if only to meet the Jews in controversy, who refused to recognize the LXX. text, and

pointed out its variations from their own. Nor did he shrink from the prospect of undertaking so arduous a labour. He had already spent some years in learning Hebrew, and under the tuition of some Jewish instructors had acquired proficiency in the art of rendering it into Latin. He also took pains to acquire good Hebrew MSS. from these Jewish instructors, MSS. which, as comparison with the Masoretic and the LXX. texts shows, differed largely from the latter and approximated closely but not entirely to the former. He has left on record the principles on which he proceeded, and the internal evidence of the text shows how far he adhered to them. He was anxious on the one hand to depart as little as possible from the wording of the old Latin version, in places where the meaning was identical, or nearly identical, with that of his Hebrew MSS.; and on the other hand, he sought to render the sense rather than the exact words (when the difference of idiom made the two incompatible), and to infuse a little more elegance into the style. Translating on these lines he began this *chef-d'œuvre* of his Biblical labours in 390, and was occupied with it till 405. He translated all the proto-canonical books, together with the deutero-canonical parts of Daniel and Esther and the Books of Judith and Tobias, these deutero-canonical parts from the Chaldaic with the aid of an interpreter. He did not succeed equally with all these books. The historical books and the Book of Job are his best, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles come next, which is surprising, as according to his own (hardly credible) account, he finished them all off in three days. His translation of the Psalms suffers somewhat in smoothness and elegance from his otherwise praiseworthy endeavour to be extremely literal. In the Prophets also he loses in distinction of style through adhering so closely to the Hebrew constructions—an offence which we, in these remote times, can the more readily pardon since, if it detracts somewhat from the value of his version for public use, it makes it a proportionately better witness to the text of his Hebrew copy. The Books of Judith and Tobias, which he deemed apocryphal, were the least satisfactory of his translations. The latter he rendered very freely—"rather from sense to sense than from word to word," in one night's work, is his own phrase; the former he finished in one day, an interpreter translating orally from Chaldaic to Hebrew, and Jerome translating from this man's Hebrew into Latin. Also, apart from these defects, due to haste or ill-success, there are others due to unsound

method. Such are the occasional omissions of what he judged useless repetitions, and some renderings which convert into apparently distinct Messianic prophecies what in the original lend themselves less readily, or not at all, to that construction.¹ When, however, the needful reserves have been made for these defects, it remains that, in the consentient verdict of the critics, this Hieronymian version is admirable in its quality, and well deserving of the place it has attained as the authorized version of the Catholic Church.

This place, however, it only attained gradually, and as the result of a growing recognition of its merits rather than by the action of Church authority—that is, till the time of the Council of Trent. At first it met with an intense opposition in many quarters. What happened in recent days among the Anglicans on the attempt to substitute the revised for the authorized version in the service of their Church, was but an illustration of the feeling with which human nature is ever apt to resent alterations in the accustomed language of its Sacred Books. Generation after generation has grown accustomed to the existing words and phrases, and impressive associations have gathered round them, until the faithful have come to venerate them for their own sakes, and to forget that after all they only possess a representative character, and that it is in proportion only as they fulfil this character correctly that they are worthy of their place in the affections and reverence of devout minds. A curious and well-known instance of this amiable perversity we have on the authority of St. Augustine, who tells us how, when an old African Bishop reading from St. Jerome's new version spoke of the "ivy" instead of the "gourd" under which Jonas was sheltered, the whole congregation rose up in indignation, and would not be satisfied until their old version was restored to them. Nor under these circumstances was it wonderful that St. Augustine himself hesitated for a time as to the expediency of St. Jerome's work, and even asked him to discontinue it. Still, St. Augustine was too much of a student not to be won over to the new translation when he came to study it more carefully, and in like manner it commended itself, in that and the following generations, to other distinguished Fathers such as John Cassian, Eucherius of Lyons, Vincent of Lerins, Prosper of Aquitaine, Cæsar of Arles, St. Leo

¹ For examples of these defects see Gigot's *General Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures*, pp. 322—325.

the Great, St. Gregory the Great. Hence it won its way steadily first into favour, and then into acceptance, not only among the writers and students, but even in the liturgy of the Church. St. Jerome's Psalter, however—and it is matter of regret that it should have been so—could never succeed in dispossessing the older text, this being the portion of Scripture with which the people were the most familiar, and the least prepared to see changed in its language. Accordingly, our present Vulgate consists, as regards the Old Testament, of St. Jerome's translation from the Hebrew, except in the case of the Psalms, which is still the Gallican Psalter, or St. Jerome's second revision of the old Latin translation from the Septuagint.¹ The deuterocanonical books, save Tobias and Judith, are in the *Vetus Itala* Version. As regards the New Testament our Vulgate version is St. Jerome's revision of the ancient *Itala* with the aid of the Greek text in Origen's *Hexaplar*.

We have seen that what first led St. Jerome to undertake his labours for the improvement of our Scripture text, was the corruption which three centuries of faulty transcription had introduced into the text of the *Vetus Itala*. These same sources of corruption continued to work in the centuries subsequent to St. Jerome's, and his own Vulgate version was seriously affected by them, until the time came when that could be said almost as well of this version which he himself had said of the older version he undertook to revise, "there are as many versions of it as there are manuscripts." These faults of transcription are of two kinds, for the transcriber may introduce a false reading into his MS., either (1) unconsciously, by defect of sight as when he skips a word or misreads it on account of its likeness to some other, or defect of hearing when he writes to the dictation of another, or defect of memory when forgetting the exact word he has read or heard, he writes down one more or less like it; or when (2) he consciously corrects the text before him on some mistaken principle, as when he incorporates into his text the marginal glosses of his copy, deeming them to have been omissions in the transcription of his copy, or corrects

¹ In the Roman Breviary the text of the Gallican Psalter is followed in the Psalms, but that of the Roman, though not quite consistently, in the Invitatorium, and in the Antiphons and Responsoria *de tempore*. The Introits, Graduals, Offertories, and Communions, in the Roman Missal are also taken from the Psalter according to the text of the Roman Psalter. This intermixture is a trace left of the gradual manner in which the Gallican supplanted the Roman version, and the latter the *Vetus Itala*.

ungrammatical constructions or difficult terms, or terms in apparent contradiction with what the Bible has elsewhere, imagining that in so doing he is correcting the mistakes of the former transcribers, or again, when he completes quotations which the copy gave only in part, or interpolates doxologies and such like from his memory of a liturgy in which these are added to the text. Again, a transcriber not acquainted with sound principles of textual criticism, as no transcribers were until comparatively recent times, was prone when he had before him MSS. containing variant texts to "mix" them by transferring the readings of one into the other in the copy he was making, being guided in so doing by some unsound principle, such as that the one which yielded the clearest or richest sense was to be preferred, or that the two should be combined into one whole that nothing might be lost. Moreover, these transcribers oftentimes had access only to inferior texts as copies, nor were able to divine what might be the real character and quality of their copies; and, in particular, could not distinguish the MSS. containing St. Jerome's Vulgate and those containing the old *Itala*. With these causes of corruption ever at work it can be imagined what confusion ensued as time ran on, how the varieties of text divided off into groups mainly determined by the differences of locality and ecclesiastical organization, and how, whilst some groups remained purer than others, there were few MSS. entirely free from the intermixture of the Vulgate and the more ancient text.

From time to time endeavours were made to check this process of corruption, and to regain a purer text. Such was the revision of Cassiodorus in the sixth century, of Alcuin and Theodulphus in the turn of the eighth and ninth. Such were the *Correctoria* or collections of variant readings, either marked in the margins of existing or newly written MSS., or else written out in separate volumes, which originated in the thirteenth century. Of these there were three notable ones—the *Parisiense* (1236 circa), the *Dominicanum* (1240 circa), and the *Sorbonicum*, of which the last is considered to be the best. Some of these ancient revisions have been useful not only to the age in which they were made, but also to modern revisers. This is especially the case with the Alcuin recension, which is considered to be well preserved in some still extant MSS., particularly in the ninth century *Codices Paulinus* and the *Valllicellianus*. We have too the texts of the three *Correctoria* mentioned, and these

of course are especially valuable for the number and description of the readings they contain.

When at length the age of printing had dawned, although it furnished a far more efficacious method of stopping the course of textual corruption, in the first instance it tended to increase it, as the earliest printed editions were not taken from the best texts. That there were all these textual problems to consider did not occur to the minds of the first printers, and they took for their copies the MSS. nearest and most convenient to hand. The first to attend to these matters and endeavour to give a pure text based on the best MSS. were the editors of the Complutensian edition (of 1517). Then came Robert Stephanus of Paris, who published three successive editions (1528, 1532, and 1540) of the whole Vulgate based on a very careful collation of old MSS. in the libraries at St. Germain des Près, St. Denis and elsewhere—amounting in the preparation for his third edition to twenty in number. On the other hand, as we have already had occasion to say, it was at this time that the lust of retranslating from the original languages set in, and produced texts which were in reality texts of the Vulgate extensively corrupted by corrections from the Hebrew, Greek, and other Vulgate texts, highly seasoned with a subjectivism of interpretation which had the effect of involving all in the greatest confusion.

S. F. S.

Mary Queen of Scots and the Babington Plot.

II. THE SECOND ACT.

AS soon as Elizabeth heard of the accusations brought by Dr. Parry against Thomas Morgan, she passionately vowed to be revenged upon him, and ordered her Ambassador in Paris to present an urgent request to the King of France for his arrest and extradition.¹ The King had many reasons for wishing to stand well with her, and complied so far as to throw the man into the Bastille, and to put his correspondence under lock and key, but he was slow to go further. The English Queen was naturally detested by the French people, and the officials of course arranged that nothing compromising should be found among Morgan's papers when the time came for giving them up. As for handing Mary's servant over to be tortured into a confession of guilt, the French King, despicable as his general policy was, would not consent to make himself guilty of so dishonourable a breach of the law of nations.

In her deep vexation Elizabeth wrote to the King a characteristic letter, which began by saying she was *enragée* to receive his note, and concluded with the words: "I swear to you that if he is denied me, I shall conclude that I have joined a league not with a King but with a Papal Legate or the President of a seminary. I shall be as much ashamed at yours as I should at their bad company."²

No wonder that Morgan was rather better than worse treated after such an outburst of spleen. But for all that the Welshman was kept in the Bastille, more keen than ever to be revenged on his enemies, who on their side were more than ever alert to entrap the rash, quarrelsome man in some intrigue that might ruin both him and his mistress. We must not of course go so far as to say that Walsingham planned beforehand every step subsequently taken by his spies and employés nor

¹ February, 1585.

² March 24, 1585.

has any evidence been brought to support the allegation that he had some of the principal conspirators in his pay. There was a rumour at the time that he had employed Ballard, and Queen Mary alluded to it at her trial, whereupon Walsingham made a protest, which is worthy of attention :

My mind is far from malice. I call God to record that as a private person I have done nothing unbecoming an honest man. Nor, as I bear the place of a public man, have I done anything unworthy of my place. I confess that, being very careful for the safety of the Queen and realm, I have curiously searched out practices against the same. If Ballard had offered me his help, I would not have refused it. Yea, I would have recompensed the pains he had taken. If I have practised anything with him, why did he not utter it to save his life?¹

Walsingham therefore "calls God to record" that he has done as a private person "nothing unbecoming an honest man," and as a public man, nothing "unworthy of my place." We notice the significant distinction between public and private honesty, and the low standard claimed for the latter. Indeed, if it were fair to take his words *au pied de la lettre*, one might ask what public dishonesty was "unworthy of his place"? However this may be, Walsingham maintains that the worst he has done even in his public capacity is "curiously to search out practices," and to encourage, "yea, recompense," informers who offered him their services.

This confession is probably true to this extent, that Walsingham did not in person assume the part of tempter, nor prescribe to his spies and agents the exact line they were to take (at least not as a rule). But of course this entirely understates his responsibility for the plots, which he gloried in bringing to light, and which, his admirers believe, would have been the ruin of England but for his patriotic services.

These admirers forget that there would have been no conspirators but for the multitude of injured men then in England who had no remedy for their wrongs; and that their wrongs and sufferings were the result of the cruel and tyrannical persecution of which Walsingham was the chief upholder. By the time of Babington's Plot, no doubt, he could appeal with a calm conscience to the All-Knowing God to record his innocence, for he had long since blotted out from his memory his responsibility for the crimes with which he was so familiar.

¹ *State Trials*, 1730, p. 145.

"My mind is free from malice." That is to say he saw nothing amiss in the system of violence, cant, and fraud of which he was the centre and prime mover. He encouraged, assisted, and "recompensed the pains" of his informers, and by so doing he clearly made himself, in the sight of that God whom he invoked, responsible for the treachery and lies, and for the hateful wickedness of their multiplied and prolonged plotting against the life of his victim.

The efforts of these scoundrels were favoured by many circumstances, above all by the quarrelsome, unscrupulous character of Thomas Morgan. He had acquired Mary's favour by his activity in managing to find messengers for her correspondence, and in dunning the French Government for the payment of her dowry, and she had rewarded him by giving him her confidence, and the control over a large part of her income, which was a great source of power among the poverty-stricken exiles. Then there had arisen a quarrel between the "Welsh" and the "English" party, and Morgan, as the leader of the Welsh, had undertaken a fierce *vendetta* against Dr. Allen, Father Persons, and the other leaders of the "English," a course which, whatever the merits of the quarrel, could eventually only tell in Mary's disfavour.

Another circumstance was Morgan's imprisonment. Had he been free, and able to make personal inquiries into the credentials of those who we shall see palming themselves off upon him as friends and sympathizers, he would not, I feel sure, have been befooled as grossly as he was time after time. His detention was at once sufficiently lax to allow the adventure-some to get in to him, sufficiently strict to keep ordinary friends out, and withal to excite continually his desire for revenge.

Unable to attend personally to the important negotiations confided to him by his mistress, Morgan now made use of Mr. Charles Paget as his lieutenant, who was in his turn as unreliable as his chief. To say nothing of certain quarrels which preceded his leaving England,¹ we find him at first begging for Elizabeth's pardon. When his prayer was refused, he flew to the opposite extreme, and encouraged Elizabeth's foreign enemies and conspiracies against her life. When Mary was dead, and his pension from her had ceased, he returned to his old prayer for mercy from England, and attacked the Jesuits with the utmost virulence, charging Persons, for instance, with

¹ *Catholic Record Society*, vol. iii. p. 183.

having given that encouragement to Babington and Savage of which he himself had been guilty. His prayers were again spurned, the English agents describing him as "an unconstant fellow, full of practices, true to no side."¹ Eventually, however, after King James' accession he obtained pardon, and so made his exit with better fortune, surely, than he deserved. But whatever may be the merits of his quarrels and changes, one thing at least seems clear, that he was hardly the right man to help Morgan through a difficult crisis when great prudence and great self-restraint were imperatively required.

It was perhaps the weakest point in Mary's otherwise wonderful character that she was a bad judge of men. All her calamities may be said to have come from her inability to distinguish between those who, though shallow and imprudent, were attractive, pushful, self-assertive, from men who did not make so brave a show, though in reality more capable, steadfast, and estimable. She was not, I think, deceived (though some opponents said she was) in believing Morgan and Paget to have been substantially faithful to her. But good intentions were not likely to counterbalance the ill results that were morally sure to follow from leaving the guidance of her fortunes to persons so unscrupulous, so quarrelsome, so reckless as they. It was the opinion of Cardinal Allen at the time that Mary was "ruinated" by her servants' "unfortunate proceedings," and Dr. Lingard arrived at the same conclusion upon a mature consideration of the papers that have been subsequently published.²

The first to offer Walsingham his services against Morgan was one Robert Bruce, a Scotch gentleman of good family, the younger brother of the Laird of Binnie. His treachery was not suspected by our older historians, but the subsequent career at least of this unscrupulous man has been briefly but well described by the late T. G. Law in the Appendix to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, though even he was not aware that Bruce's bad faith began at this date. Just before Morgan's arrest he was dealing on the one hand with Morgan, from whom he procured ample letters of credit and information about all

¹ The article on Paget in the *Dictionary of National Biography* is rather incomplete. For the quarrel with the Jesuits see his articles and their answers, Stonyhurst, *Anglia* ii. n. 46, also *Catholic Record Society*, vol. iii. p. 183, and *Domestic Calendars* for 1598, 1599, pp. 68, 234.

² Knox, *Letters of Cardinal Allen*, p. 328; Lingard's *History*, vol. vi. pp. 405, 569, 640.

the plans of the party, and on the other he was proffering these secrets to the English Secretary through the Ambassador at Paris, but on the condition that he must be *well* paid. Sir Edward Stafford thereupon wrote home :

He promiseth and offereth great things, but plainly he sayeth—that “a working man is worthy of his hire,” and will not put himself in danger without certainty of a reward (both standing for his life) as long as he serveth well : and now also presently, for, as he sayeth, he is debt almost two hundred crowns here. Because it is an extraordinary reward, I thought good to advertise you, that her Majesty's pleasure may be known ; as also what he shall trust unto to have, while he doth service to deserve it. . . .

The man is a great papist, and you may be sure that it is either spite or gain or both, that maketh him to do it. I leave all things to your honour's judgment. But in my judgment two hundred crownes were well ventured to get such an service, for I think that he will be able and willing to discover matter of importance.

Although there be no trust to a knave, that will deceive them that trust him ; yet such as he is must be entertained. For if there were no knaves, honest men should hardly come by the truth of any enterprise against them.¹

The last sentence is a good example of the political morality of Walsingham and his subordinates. “*Knaves must be entertained that honest men may come to the truth!*” Elizabeth's parsimony *seems* to have saved her on this occasion from having directly encouraged Bruce's knavery. But the only reason for thinking so, is because we find him a year later still offering to sacrifice his honour for English gold, and Stafford still urging the advantages of employing him.

Robert Pooley, or Poley, was a different sort of blackguard. He was in Walsingham's confidence at the same time that he was hailed as “Sweet Robin” by Babington and his friends. When the Plot was approaching maturity it was his *rôle* to keep the plotters within the reach of Walsingham's arm until everything was ready for their destruction. On this occasion he came direct from England to the Bastille, bringing with him letters from Christopher, afterwards Sir Christopher Blount, a gentleman in Leicester's retinue. Morgan had most imprudently asked Blount to correspond with himself and Mary, and Blount's answer was to send Poley, who played his part so well that both Morgan and Paget wrote in July commending him to their mistress.

¹ Stafford to Walsingham. R.O., *French Correspondence*, January 25, 1585.

A week later, however, Morgan heard that Poley's letter had been intercepted, and that this means of conveyance would be unsafe until the matter was cleared.¹ Later on Morgan returned to his praises of Poley, but Mary does not seem to have ever employed him.

George Gifford, afterwards Sir George Gifford of Itchell, Hants, and Weston-under-Hill, Gloucester, is the next traitor whose acquaintance we have to make, or rather to renew, for I have on a previous occasion given some account of him in this periodical.² I may therefore summarize all that does not immediately concern us. He was born of a good Catholic stock, but his father died when he was quite young. He was drawn to Elizabeth's Court at an early age, made a Gentleman Pensioner, soon wasted his patrimony by extravagance, and became involved in disreputable, not to say criminal enterprises. In 1586, when he had been arrested on suspicion of complicity in Babington's Plot, it was found that he was "wanted" for a whole series of misdemeanours, receiving stolen goods, assisting burglars, and profit-sharing with robbers of many sorts. Still, he did not lose his place, or the royal favour, was eventually knighted for service against Spain, married a wife from the all-powerful Cecil family, and died a successful and an honoured man, in this world's estimate.

In April, 1583, however, as in 1586, he was in difficulties with the police. One Nix, a noted highwayman of those days, had broken prison, and Gifford was implicated in the affair. He therefore found it advisable to cross over to the Continent, where he occupied himself in a bold speculation. He applied at the beginning of May, to the Duke of Guise for a large sum of money, which he asked to have locked up, and the key delivered into his possession, until he should assassinate Elizabeth. Before many days had passed, the worthlessness of Gifford became known, and his project was rejected. But at first, alas! it was not so; such was the roughness of the times and the bad blood created by the wars of religion. The Duke's father had been assassinated by the Protestants, and this murder had exercised an evil influence over the rest of the life of the brilliant soldier, who might in better times

¹ Morgan's letter of July 20, 1585, printed in full, W. Murdin, *State Papers*, 1759, p. 446, and in the *Hatfield Calendar*, vol. iii. p. 101. See also R.O., *Mary Q.S.*, vol. xvi. 7, 8, 15, 17, 70.

² THE MONTH, June, 1902; April, 1904.

have been a national hero. His first impulse was to accept, and he communicated the plan to the Ambassador of Spain and to the Papal Nuncio, and both, it must be confessed, gave ear to the proposal with the most reprehensible calmness. They were not asked to approve, only to take advantage, and to be ready for the *débâcle*, which it was hoped would follow. They had the decency to appear a little ashamed of the proposal, but in effect they raised no objection. They communicated the proposals not indeed to their masters, but to their Secretaries of State, who in their turns took the news as calmly as Cecil read that of the impending murder of Rizzio, or as quietly as Elizabeth suggested to Paulet the advantage of ridding her of Mary, though on the whole murder by jury was more approved in Elizabeth's Court than the use of poison or of the stiletto.

The letters to which allusion has just been made, have all been printed more than once,¹ and it is necessary to say that they throw a strong light on the temper of mind which made the Babington Plot a possibility. The age of which we write perfectly understood that assassination could never be actually allowed, but it had not yet appreciated how much harm the very least toleration of such crime could do to the body politic. The sequel to our story will show but too sadly and surely how many miserable calamities might have been averted from the Catholic cause, but for those unworthy answers to George Gifford's vile offers. The answers became known in an exaggerated version through Gilbert Gifford to Babington and his fellows, and alas! formed one of the snares by means of which that scoundrel lured them to their doom.

To return to George Gifford: his intrigue in Paris took place during the months of April and May, 1583, at the end of which month the Nuncio writes that it will come to nothing. At midsummer he is back at Elizabeth's Court acting as Gentleman Pensioner, and drew his half a crown a day, "bourdwagis" for "four score and seventeen dayes," that is for the whole Michaelmas quarter, June 24th to September 28, 1583.² He appears, as was natural, to have said little of his bogus plot. Perhaps he

¹ THE MONTH, June, 1902; T. F. Knox, *Letters of Cardinal Allen*, 1882, pp. 412, 413, 414; J. Kretschmar, *Invasionsprojekte der Katholischen Mächte gegen England* (Leipzig, 1902), Nos. 24, 25; A. Teulet, *Relations Politiques*, vol. v. p. 276; *Spanish Calendar*, pp. 464, 479.

² R.O., Exchequer of Receipt, Gentlemen Pensioners' Rolls, no. 14. The rolls for the three previous quarters are unfortunately wanting.

hoped to succeed better next time, if he kept silence now; again, it was not to his credit that those whom he had duped at first, should so soon have discovered his worthlessness, while they on their side were also constrained to silence, for their initial readiness to take him up was most discreditable to them. Some knowledge of his proceedings, however, did become known to others, though only in secrecy and to few. To so very few that Gifford was perhaps emboldened in 1585 to go over again, and to tempt Morgan, as the other rascals were doing. This, however, is not certain, indeed, to me it seems less likely. But it is at least certain that the bad example he had given two years previously was then working for evil, and was beginning to bear the worst fruit.¹

The next tempter to proffer his services to Morgan was Nicholas Berden, whose real name seems to have been Thomas Rogers. He had been the trusted servant of the heroic Mr. George Gilbert, who had in 1581 done so much to make the mission of Persons and Campion a success, having personally conducted them to many of the principal Catholic houses. When he was forced to go into exile, his servant, who was in practice almost as well acquainted with the Catholics as his master, went with him to Rome. But Rogers ere long grew

¹ There are a number of obscure points connected with this episode, though they do not affect the main course of our history. For instance, both Mendoza, the Spanish Ambassador, and Father Persons speak of Gifford's treachery as occurring in the year 1585 (*THE MONTH*, June, 1902), and they were certainly both well-informed men. But they so speak in *later* letters, and both are silent about the offers of 1583, the date of which is beyond doubt. Possibly therefore they are speaking loosely, or their memory for the date was defective.

That some persons obtained knowledge of George Gilbert's transaction about the time we are considering is clear from the statements of Father Gaspar Heywood, and of Gilbert Gifford. The latter may *perhaps* have heard of the affair through Morgan at the end of this year 1585, but Heywood (who was exiled from England early in 1585, after imprisonment in the Tower since December 9, 1583, *C.R.S.* II. 232), must have heard it earlier: and he explicitly says that George on his return to England "betrayed the whole affair." But this *cannot* be quite correct, or there would have been no purpose in imprisoning him later.

Omitting several details, for which there is not space here, I am inclined to think that George *played double all through*. During his disgrace of 1583 he may in vexation have plotted in earnest, then when he had regained favour at home, or when his worthlessness was discovered, he would have come back and pretended it was all a sham on his part, and yet not have told all, nor made the matter really public. There would thus have been an ostensible reason for charging him with the affair of 1583, when he was arrested in 1586, and still he could plausibly have denied the charge (as indeed he did) because of its discrepancies in detail from what he had confessed at first; and the persons to whom he confessed at first would have been ready to excuse him.

weary of the restraints of exile, and by 1583 he had become a correspondent of Walsingham.¹ Some of these letters were, however, discovered, and at the request of Allen and Persons, he was for a while placed under restraint in Castel S. Angelo, together with Father Persons' old servant, Roger Alfield, who had also been detected in the same treachery. Upon promise of fidelity, however, both of them were freed and were afterwards allowed to return to England. Roger Alfield then threw off the mask, became a pursuivant, and was one of the most active and hurtful of those evildoers. Thomas Rogers, on the other hand, continued his affectation of faithfulness without being discovered. Twenty years later Father Persons wrote of him in his memoirs, "*fecit bene*—he did well," after his liberation, whereas in reality his hidden treacheries were for many years even more injurious than Alfield's open violence.

In July, 1585, Rogers, or Berden as he is henceforward called, was arrested, doubtless by prearrangement with Walsingham, and thrown into prison in company with the priest and future martyr, Edward Stransham, and then having got out of prison (ostensibly through the mediation of a Protestant relative), he betook himself to Paris, with letters, &c., of Stransham in his possession, which he used as tokens to Stransham's friends in Paris, and through them he was ere long introduced to Morgan. There are a fair number of his letters to Walsingham extant, and from them we can watch the progress of his intrigues.² He did not attempt to initiate conspiracies of his own. That would in any case have been premature, moreover he was a mean villain whose ambitions were of a lower class: to steal letters, to betray confidences, to inform against priests, and above all to become the messenger between Morgan and Mary's friends in England. He had come as the old servant of Mr. Gilbert, the friend of the Jesuits, and time was needed for him to ingratiate himself with the leaders of the opposite faction. By the end of the year, however, he had attained this object, for on December 28th he announces that they (that is, Morgan and Paget), wish him to go over and try to open up correspondence with Mary. But while he thus seemed to have been on the point of complete success, his next letter showed that his services were after all not likely to be required, for he sends word that Morgan had received the

¹ R.O., *Mary Queen of Scots*, xxi. 6.

² *Additional Calendar*, vol. xxix. nn. 38, 42, 45, 47, 52, 55, 62, 85.

news that Gilbert Gifford, after some adventures, was likely to accomplish all that could be expected from himself. Berden's services therefore were now not likely to be wanted in Paris, so he returned to England, where we shall soon meet him again.

The appearance upon the scene of Gilbert Gifford, to whose adroit provocation the Babington Plot owed its existence, marks the opening of a new act in the tragedy. I have said something about his early career already in these pages,¹ but some of the points must be repeated. Gilbert was the son of John Gifford, of Chillington, a family noted for its firm adhesion to the ancient faith. A couple of generations later (by which time the family name had taken the form Giffard) they won themselves an honoured place in the history of the country by their heroism in helping to save Prince Charles after the Battle of Worcester. Gilbert was a somewhat distant cousin of the George Gifford of whom we have spoken before, the Hampshire branch having, as it seems, migrated from Staffordshire when William de Gifford (died 1129) became Bishop of Winchester. The Doctor William Gifford, whom we shall meet with further on, was of this Hampshire branch, and brother to George. It will be our misfortune to see little else here but the weak side of this William, though in later life, when the unfortunate ascendancy which Gilbert won over him during their college career had passed away, he became a very great and a very good man, an honoured member of the Benedictine Order, and eventually Archbishop of Rheims and Primate of France, perhaps the only Englishman who ever occupied that post.

Gilbert Gifford seems to have come abroad about 1577, and after a stay at Paris, to have gone to the English College at Rome, where he took the College oath on the 23rd of April, 1579, being then nineteen years of age. Six months later he was joined by his cousin William, who was two years his senior in age, but over whom he soon gained a very unfortunate predominance. Gilbert had been at college during the unfortunate disturbances, which were occasioned by the inefficiency of the first Rector, an old Welsh churchman, to rule the newly-founded College, and then took part vigorously in the resistance offered to "the Welsh." But when the Welsh Rector had been removed, he became more unmanageable still. Before September, 1580,

¹ THE MONTH, April, 1904.

he had to be expelled, but an allowance was given him to continue his studies outside the College for a year and a half, and when his cousin William had completed his College course, they both set out northwards. Instead of settling down at Rheims, however, there ensued fifteen months of vagabond life spent roaming over England and the Continent, during which time his friends frankly gave him up for lost. At last he turned up in rags at Rheims, crying and showing every sign of repentance. Though at first Allen would not receive him, he afterwards, with an over-facility which I cannot excuse, admitted him to the Seminary, and to the preparation for the priesthood.

As we have no bad news of him during these two and a half years, we might naturally suppose that they had been well spent. But at the end of that time we find him quite calmly occupied on a work of startling wickedness. He was hatching a plot against Elizabeth's life at Douay College itself.

From the *Douay Diaries*, we learn that one John Savage was living there in 1581, having received Confirmation on Lady Day, and he left on the 1st of December. We know nothing of his parentage. The *Douay Diary* happens on two occasions to describe his companions as *nobiles*, i.e., of gentle birth, from which an inference might be made that he belonged to the yeoman class. At his arrest and trial he was reported as having no goods, except a horse, which was given as a reward to the pursuivant who captured him. Yet he seems to have consorted on equal terms with other gentlemen of birth and property, and Gilbert Gifford¹ calls him "one of the best of companions." What he did when he left the College does not appear. It was then, very possibly, that he enlisted under the Duke of Parma. The Queen's Counsel at his trial seemed to believe that he was there almost up to the time when the conspiracy was hatched. But the *Diary* informs us that he returned as early as the 10th of May, 1583, and the next thing noted concerning him is his departure on the 16th of August, 1585. If (as is likely) he remained at College all that time, we must presume that he was studying for the priesthood, and should have to consider him a *prêtre manqué*, an unbalanced pietist, rather than a dare-devil soldier ready for any violence, as the Crown lawyers tried to represent him. However this may be, the sum-total of our information about him produces the impression of a harmless, somewhat shallow-minded, wooden

¹ Morris, *Sir Amias Poulet*, p. 381.

fellow, easily led, and wanting in initiative, over whom Gilbert Gifford had won a great ascendancy. Savage accepts his word on matters of supreme importance, and Gilbert scolds him roundly if he does not carry out his behests.

Another College friend of both Gilbert and Savage was Christopher Hodgson, a priest of the English College, Rome, and now, like Gilbert, a reader, or tutor as we might say, in Philosophy at Rheims. Like Gilbert he was also miserably factious, and though he did not fall so low as his companions, he afterwards became a restless wanderer, a sacerdotal failure.¹

One day, about midsummer, 1585, Hodgson and Savage were talking about "exploits," when they were joined by Dr. William and also by Gilbert Gifford. The conversation turned to the assassination of Elizabeth, and Savage believed that he was solicited to kill her. Eventually, after thinking the matter over for three weeks, Savage agreed and swore that he would do so, being, it would seem, distinctly under the impression that Dr. Gifford considered this as praiseworthy and meritorious. I do not myself believe that this was Dr. Gifford's opinion, nor in truth do I feel *certain* even of the leading facts above summarized, the evidence for which is liable to very grave exceptions.

For not only is there no record at all of the story from either of the two Giffords or from Hodgson, but the confession of Savage, the only evidence which we have, has come to us in an intentionally mangled form. It was manipulated, moreover, on purpose to produce the impression that Dr. Gifford was tempter-in-chief, while Gilbert's name is omitted entirely, as it is in many of the documents about the Plot published by the Government. The object of this was to hide as far as possible his real share in the Plot. I have been fortunate enough to find a less emasculated recension, which I propose to print in due time. For the present it must suffice to say that this recension proves that Gilbert had his share in the seduction of Savage, and makes it seem likely that, if we could get still nearer the truth, we should find Gilbert acting the principal part, and that Dr. William's only share in the matter was that of giving answers to questions skilfully proposed to him by Gilbert, answers the bearing of which the doctor may not have appreciated. Upon a broad consideration of the

¹ *Catholic Record Society*, vol. ii. pp. 134, 205, and notes.

whole story this is the hypothesis which I favour, though I do not in any way build upon it.

In the August following, Savage left the Seminary in order (it is said) to put his supposed plot into execution, and Morgan is believed to have written to him urging him to perform his promises. So he set off for England to execute his vow, without however having made any definite plans how to do so. He remained about London, and was resolved (so his "confession" states), to strike a blow, if the chance should offer, and still of a mind that such a blow would be justifiable. Gilbert, meantime, continued his studies for the priesthood, entirely unconcerned for Elizabeth's danger, either then, or later, when he was in close and constant intercourse with Walsingham. Indeed it was exactly then that he tried his best to excite Savage to action!

The conclusion must surely be that danger from Savage was, at least, very remote. My idea is that Savage was perhaps a *stupid* fellow, whose heaviness was, on the one hand, a sufficient safeguard to preclude the fear of any sudden execution of his resolves, while on the other hand, Gilbert, when present, could talk him into any frame of mind that might be desired.

This unpractical conspirator having left the College in August, Gilbert continued quietly at Rheims, while his cousin William was summoned by Morgan to Paris in September. Rogers tells us that Morgan's object was to send him to England, probably in order that he might act as a sort of figure-head for the so-called "Welsh" faction. For as the persecution had killed off all the leading laymen among the Catholics, they had come to look for leadership to clerics like Allen and Persons, and these were all on the so-called "English" side. Morgan was therefore endeavouring to get a clergyman of repute to represent him, and we see from his letters and from those of Charles Paget, that they endeavoured to push Christopher Bagshaw, Alban Dolman, Meredith Hanmer and others, into the foreground, and next spring they renewed the attempt with Dr. Gifford. There was, of course, nothing reprehensible in this. Yet such was the rashness of Morgan and his friends, that all their clerical allies were betrayed by their letters, or fared the worse for their patronage.

Be this as it may, Dr. Gifford refused Morgan's offer, and returned to Rheims accompanied by Edward Grately, a clever

young priest and a fellow-student with the Giffords, but who, alas! was like them entirely bewitched by Morgan's wretched feud. Grately begged Gilbert, though not yet a priest, to come and take the place which Dr. William had refused. Gilbert consented, left the College on October 8th, and was warmly welcomed by Morgan, who wrote an extremely long letter in his favour to Queen Mary.¹ It is far too long to quote here, but it is well worthy of study as showing how little real skill Morgan had in correspondence of this kind. It abounds in minute instructions, which were perhaps impracticable, and in unnecessary details, as to which he could form no safe judgment under his circumstances, and which would do great harm if the letter was intercepted, as it was. But of course the chief point is his enthusiastic commendation of Gilbert himself, and he follows this up by serious advice that she should open out to Phelippes, the decipherer, of whom we shall now hear a great deal.

Thus Morgan was now entirely "captured" by the *agent provocateur*, and henceforth every apparent success of the traitor would enhance his influence over the Queen's confidant. A long step forward had been taken towards inveigling Mary into the death-trap. We have seen the persistent efforts of the underlings of Elizabeth's Court to accomplish this feat. The names of Pooley, Philips, Berden, and George Gifford are preserved to us, and there were doubtless others whose names have not reached us. We have also seen the offers made by would-be traitors on the Catholic side, especially Bruce, and of these, too, the chances are that there were a good many more than we now know. At last the object has been attained, and Gilbert Gifford, with Morgan's commendations in his pocket, is off to England, to weave with consummate art his subtle toils round the imprisoned Queen.

J. H. POLLEN.

¹ Printed in full in Murdin, p. 454.

The "Baptism" of Bells.

NO one who is at all intimately acquainted with the phases of religious controversy in the sixteenth century can have failed to remark the seemingly quite unreasonable violence of the Reformers' denunciation of the ceremony of the consecration of bells. When we look into the modern Roman Pontifical and compare the very innocent rites and prayers provided for this occasion with the language of early Protestant controversialists it appears somewhat difficult to understand what all the trouble was about. That any form of exorcism or benediction as applied to inanimate objects might be objected to on principle is sufficiently intelligible.¹ But in that case it would have seemed much more natural to take exception to the constantly recurring blessings of holy water, candles, palms, and ashes, not to speak of the consecration of the holy oils, and of chalices, vestments, altars, or churchyards. But why fasten upon anything so remote from every-day experience as the ritual provided for church-bells? Even in Catholic times the consecration of a bell was an event which in any assigned church was hardly likely to occur more than once in a generation. Neither am I aware that this ceremony was ever attended with that lavish concession of Indulgences so often associated with the consecration of churches. At first blush the prominence given to this grievance by the Reformers is not a little puzzling.

There can, however, be no doubt that the principal ground of offence was the suggestion conveyed by the name popularly applied to the ceremony, *i.e.*, the "baptism" of bells. Luther himself, who was one of the first to raise the cry, denounces the ceremony as "a mockery and desecration of the sacrament." Becon, to take an English controversialist almost at random,

¹ None the less, the Church of England provides forms for the blessing of graveyards, churches, ships, and many other things.

exclaims: "How wickedly do the Papists apply baptism to dumb creatures, as to christening bells!" and Calphill, in 1565, writing against the Catholic Martiall, says in more detail:

Among them all [the devil's ministers], to the devil's behoof never so faithful servants, to the destruction of the people never so pestilent instruments as the Papists are. For what have they not done to the utter subversion of all true religion? As Christ commanded the believers in His name to be baptized, so they in the devil's name have baptized bells with the same ceremonies and solemnities that they would use in infants' christening—save that the devil would have in his sacrament a certain more majesty than God in His. Therefore the Papists, by the spirit of the devil, ordained that a Bishop must needs christen a bell, whereas every poor priest may christen a child.¹

Another controversialist, William Crashaw, the father, curiously enough, of that Richard Crashaw, the poet, who resigned his Fellowship at Peterhouse, Cambridge, and sacrificed all to become a Catholic, sets up an elaborate comparison in parallel columns between the ritual of baptism and that of the blessing of a bell. It is too long to reproduce here, but we may quote one of his concluding observations in which he declares that, after an examination of the Pontifical,

it is apparent that it is a more solemn baptism than that of the child, for the solemnitie is longer, the ceremonies more, the prayers to greater purpose, the minister of greater place, than be required for a child's baptism.²

None the less it was certainly with absolute sincerity and without a suspicion of bluff that Cardinal Bellarmine, in treating this point, bade objectors consult the Pontifical and see for themselves whether there was anything in the ritual for the consecration of bells which could reasonably be called a parody of baptism. In the first place, as he pertinently observed, it is not even *called* a baptism. The use of this word is popular and not official, and the terms *baptismus* or *baptizo* will not be found to occur in the whole course of the ceremony. But what is still more to the point, as Bellarmine again notes, the administration of any sacrament consists essentially in the combination of matter and form. The pouring of water or immersion in water in conjunction, morally speaking, with the pro-

¹ Calphill, *Answer to Martiall* (Parker Society), p. 15.

² Crashaw, *Sermon at the Crosse*, p. 118.

nouncing of the words "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," is necessary to the validity of any Baptism. But in the service *De Benedictione Signi vel Campanae* in the Roman Pontifical, we have nothing of this. The bell is *washed* with water, just as the altars are washed on Maundy Thursday, but no words accompany the washing except the recitation of psalms by the choir; neither is there anything about this feature of the ceremony which suggests the bestowal of any special property or virtue.¹ To Bellarmine, in fact, the objection seemed so extravagant that he not inexcusably made fun of it, and, to quote the version of a seventeenth century translator, remarked, "It is a marvell that Protestants doe not also say that we catechize and instruct the bells that so they may sound out the articles of Fayth."

But perhaps it will be easier to understand the force of Bellarmine's appeal to the text of the Pontifical if I recapitulate briefly the substance of this function, a function which under ordinary circumstances can only be performed by a Bishop,² and which in any case is not a ceremony of common occurrence. The Bishop, in white vestments, first recites seven psalms with his attendant clergy to implore the divine assistance. Then he mixes salt with water, and reads prayers of exorcism³ analogous to those always used in the preparation of holy water, but making special reference to the bell and to the evil influences of the air—the phantoms, the storms, the lightning which threaten the peace of devout Christians who come to the church to sing the praises of God. Then the Bishop and his attendants "wash" (*lavant*) the bell inside and out with the water thus prepared and dry it with towels, the psalm *Laudate Dominum de coelis* and five others of similar import being sung meanwhile. These are succeeded by various unctions, those on the outside of the bell being made with the oil of the sick in seven places, and those on the inside with chrism in four places. In the

¹ If there is any suggestion of parodying one of the sacraments, it would be Confirmation rather than Baptism. For a form of words is used to accompany the anointing of the bells, and this is followed, curiously enough, by the exclamation *Pax tecum*.

² Some Bishops receive faculties from the Holy See to delegate priests to represent them in performing this ceremony. But such permissions are but rarely granted.

³ These two prayers, *Benedic Domine hanc aquam*, &c., and *Deus invictas virtutis auctor*, &c., are both found in Pontificals of the eighth century; the one in the ritual of the blessing of a bell, the other in that for the dedication of a church.

prayers¹ which follow mention is made of the silver trumpets of the old law and of the fall of the walls of Jericho, while protection is asked once more against the powers of the air, and the faithful are encouraged to take refuge under the sign of the holy cross. In this respect the remarkable prologue of Longfellow's *Golden Legend* describing "Lucifer with the Powers of the Air" trying to tear down the cross from the spire of Strasburg Cathedral, leaves a generally correct impression, despite the reference to baptism :

Lucifer. Lower ! lower !
Hover downward !
Seize the loud vociferous bells, and
Clashing, clanging, to the pavement
Hurl them from their windy tower.

Voices. All thy thunders
Here are harmless !
For these bells have been anointed
And baptized with holy water !
They defy our utmost power.

The Bells.
Defunctos ploro !
Pestem fugo !
Festa decoro !

In making the unctions, and not, be it noticed, in washing the bell, a "form" is used introducing the name of the patron saint : "May this bell be ✠ hallowed, O Lord, and ✠ consecrated in the name of the ✠ Father, and of the ✠ Son, and of the ✠ Holy Ghost. In honour of St. N. Peace be to thee." Finally, the thurible, with incense and "*thymiama*,"² and myrrh is placed under the bell so that the smoke arising may fill its concavity. Then another prayer is said of similar purport to the last,³ and the ceremony ends with the reading of the passage in the Gospel concerning Martha and Mary.

Of course the most significant portion of this function, so far as regards our present purpose, is the manner of the washing. It may be interesting to quote the directions given

¹ *Deus qui per beatum Moysen, &c., and Omnipotens, sempiternus Deus, qui ante arcam foederis, &c.* Both these prayers again were used for the blessing of bells in the eighth century.

² *Thymiama* is said to be "a mixture of ground myrrh, resin, incense, and laser." But it is not quite clear why some of these substances should thus be introduced twice over. The mention of *thymiama* occurs in the earliest pontificals.

³ *Omnipotens dominator Christe, quo secundum carnis assumptionem, &c.* This prayer also is prescribed for the same purpose in eighth-century Pontificals, *e.g.*, in that of Egbert of York.

in the latest rubrical treatise on this subject, premising only that, so far as I am aware, this also represents the practice enjoined and followed by Roman rubricists for many centuries. When the water has been blessed and mixed with salt,

the Bishop dips the sprinkler into the blessed water and begins to wash the bell with it, wetting only the lip of the bell, both outside and inside. . . .

Then [being seated] he intones without chant the psalm *Lauda anima mea*, which is continued by the chanters and others present.

As soon as the Bishop has intoned the first psalm, *Lauda anima mea*, altar-boys carry two sponges and several rough towels to the bell. During the recitation of the psalms, two priests [or deacons or subdeacons] vested in surplices, dip the sponges into the blessed water and wash the whole bell with it, inside and out, and afterwards dry it with the rough towels.¹

Taken as a whole, this ritual agrees in all essentials with that in use in Carolingian times, which is found in many manuscripts, and dates probably as far back as the pontificate of Egbert of York in the middle of the eighth century. The washing and the unctions were prescribed as at present, but of old we find no trace of the form of words or of the name-giving which now accompany the latter. The selection of examples printed by Martene² seems fairly representative, though the early Spanish Ordinals, of which we shall have to speak later, were unknown to him. So far as regards the order of the ceremonies and the wording of the prayers, such early Pontificals as those of Egbert, Dunstan, Archbishop Robert,³ &c., show nothing but unimportant variations from each other and from what we still find in the Roman Pontifical at the present day. In the rubrics there is rather more divergence, but even here it is always a question of *washing*, not baptizing the bell.⁴ Thus, Egbert's Pontifical says, "*lavas eam de aqua*

¹ A. J. Schulte, *Benedicenda; Rites and Ceremonies to be observed in some of the principal functions of the Roman Pontifical and Ritual*, p. 142. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1907.

² Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesie Ritibus*, Venice, 1783, vol. ii.; p. 246, Sacramentary of Gellone; p. 253, Jumièges, i.e., the Lanaletense, as it is now more commonly called; p. 267, Narbonne, of eleventh century; p. 297, Liège, together with some general references and observations.

³ See e.g., H. A. Wilson, *The Benedictional of Archbishop Robert* (Henry Bradshaw Society), p. 184.

⁴ The *Codex Ratoldi*, cited by Menard in his notes on the Gregorian Sacramentary (Migne, *P.L.* 78, 427), has a rubric: "*Ad signum ecclesie benedicendum. In primis intingue ter in aqua.*" Now, in spite of the triple immersion, this cannot here

benedicta;" that of Archbishop Robert, "*lavetur signum cum aqua benedicta cantantibus interim vi. psalmos*;" the Gellone Sacramentary, "*dum cantes, laves eum de aqua benedicta cum oleo et sale*," &c.

From all this it must be clear that so long at least as we confine ourselves to the authoritative Roman formularies, or even to those ritual observances of the early centuries which seem to have met with any general acceptance, there is uncommonly little to justify the Reformers in their unmeasured censure. Moreover, many of them seem to have admitted the propriety of this appeal to the approved Pontificals. W. Crashaw, for example, professes to take the existing Roman form as the basis of his indictment, but it cannot be said that he is particularly straightforward in his manner of presenting the facts. For instance, in the parallel to which we have already referred, Crashaw sets out:

9. The childe must bee baptized in the name of the Trinity.

9. So the bell is washt and anoynted in the name of the Trinity.

But, as a controversialist on the Roman side effectively replies, it is not the bell's washing but the anointing which takes place in the name of the Trinity, and the two are separated by a very considerable interval. Hence, he continues:

By the like juggling together of actions that are divided one might prove that meat is christened and baptized because it is washed and blessed in the name of the Trinity; to wit, washt by the cooke before it be put into the pot, and blessed by the priest in the name of the Trinity when it is brought to the table.¹

Or, as the same writer elsewhere says very sensibly:

The matter of Baptisme is not every washing of every thing, for then the nurse in washing the child should baptize it, but a sacramentall washing, that is a washing with intention to give the sacrament of Christ; which wanting in the blessing of a bell, the washing thereof can no more truly be said to be baptisme than the washing of dishes.²

All this is so reasonable and obvious that the puzzle really is to discover how the idea of baptism ever became connected

be intended to constitute a figurative baptism. The baptism would have to be led up to by exorcisms and prayers. It would not be the first act of the ceremony. Besides, an elaborate washing follows, during which psalms are recited as in the ordinary rite.

¹ J. R., *The Overthrow of the Protestants' Pulpit Babels*. London, 1612, p. 244.

² *Ibid.* p. 242.

in the popular mind with the blessing of bells. In any case we cannot understand how so learned and intelligent an antiquary as Dr. Raven can have allowed himself to write as follows. No doubt some of the points here enumerated by him are tolerably well attested as local observances in the middle ages, but the clauses I italicize are surely very misleading.

Associated in various ways with the most ancient ritual of the Church—insomuch that Mohammedanism rejects the use of bells and substitutes the muezzin's cry—bells acquired a kind of sacred character. They were consecrated by *a complete baptismal service*; received names, had sponsors, were sprinkled with water, anointed, and finally covered with the white garment or chrisom, like infants. This usage is as old as the time of Alcuin, *and is still practised in Roman Catholic countries*.¹

Possibly Dr. Raven may not have intended to convey that all these details are still carried out, but this is the sense in which most readers will understand his words.² Hence it becomes desirable to insist that at the present day the baptismal service is certainly not in any way "complete;" and that in particular the use of sponsors and chrisom cloths has long been abolished. I may add also that there is not a trace of these adjuncts either in "the time of Alcuin" or for some centuries afterwards. Further, that Alcuin's name has apparently only been imported into the discussion in virtue of an allusion in the *De Divinis Officiis*,³ a treatise formerly, indeed, attributed to him, but now universally acknowledged to be spurious and of much later date. But it is worth while to notice some of these points in greater detail.

The earliest known ritual for the blessing of bells would seem probably to be that preserved in the Spanish Ordinals recently printed by Dom Férotin.⁴ These, if we may trust their editor, are to be assigned to the seventh century. Without

¹ *Chambers' Encyclopedia*, New Edition, 1906. Article, "Bells."

² To judge from his latest work (*The Bells of England*, 1906), it is not quite easy to understand what view Dr. Raven holds about the baptism of bells. He manages, perhaps without intending it, to leave the impression that though Catholics deny it for controversial reasons, the baptism of bells does take place. (See pp. 37—40 and 318—320.) The fact seems to be that he fails to grasp the point of the Catholic position. No one denies that bells are washed with blessed water, but we deny that this can in any proper sense be spoken of as a baptism.

³ Cap. *De Sabbato Sancto Paschae*: "Neque novum videri debet campanas benedicere et ungere et eis nomen imponere." This is the reference given by Crashaw, but I cannot find the passage in any of the editions which I have examined.

⁴ *Monumenta Liturgica*, vol. v. pp. 159, 160.

committing ourselves to an opinion on the precise date, the *Exorcismus et Benedictio ad consecrandum signum basilicæ* are in any case very early, and they differ entirely from the form of the Roman Pontifical. They contain no mention of the washing or anointing of the bell, much less of anything analogous to baptism. Though the prayers in their general purport touch upon much the same class of ideas as the Roman prayers, there is no resemblance in their wording. The devil ("Thou most evil and foul spirit") is adjured to fly from and quit this metal, "and as thou knowest that thou hadst no share in creating it, so do thou deliver it from the contagion of thy polluting presence." This, with much more to the same effect, constitutes the "exorcism." Then, in the "benediction" which follows, we have less explicit reference to "the powers of the air," the lightning, and the thunderbolts than in the forms now in use. On the other hand, God is asked to look propitiously upon this vessel formed of the blending of divers metals (*hoc vas concretum generibus metallorum*), and He is reminded of the trumpets which went before the people of Israel, and of the bells upon the robe of the High Priest. The blessing prays also that the bells may be a reminder of God's law, and may dissipate torpor and sloth, and then it concludes in some such terms as these:

Let also the sound of these bells, O Lord, strike terror into the hearts of Jews and misbelievers that they may repent of their malice, but let it bring consolation and support to the weak and to the sorrowful; and as Thou didst set Thy bow in the sky, promising never again to destroy the human race by a deluge, so do Thou look down tenderly and in mercy upon these vessels which we now consecrate to Thee, that when they serve Thee by their clanging Thou mayst so temper every visitation and plague which sinners have deserved, that Thy people may escape all harm (*omnia adversa*), and may rejoice at having experienced the generosity of Thy mercy.

I have dwelt somewhat upon this early Spanish form because I confess that I have been much struck by the fact that neither here nor in the prayers now used, which, as we have seen, go back to the Egbert Pontifical of c. 765, is there any mention of baptism¹ or even anything which leads up to the idea of a baptism. It is surely remarkable that there is a complete absence of those many allusions which one would

¹ The word *baptismus* does occur in one of the prayers in the *Ordo Romanus* of Hittorp, but this is an exceptional form of the blessing, and the allusion is quite accidental. (See Hittorp, *De Divinis Officiis*, edit. Paris, 1610, pp. 140—143.)

have expected to find, viz., to such topics as the baptism of our Lord in the Jordan, the Ephpheta which gave speech to the dumb man, the cleansing of Naaman, and so forth. Looking at the prayers alone, both the Spanish and the Egbertine forms seem to me to show a kindred inspiration, but an inspiration which originally knew nothing of this function as a baptism. The more carefully we study the whole ceremony the stronger the presumption becomes that the Spanish form with its simple exorcism and benedictory prayers represents the original type of ceremony even in more northern lands, and that the washings and unctions which we find in the ninth century Pontificals are interpolations which have been subsequently introduced into a service originally much more simple. It seems clearly to have belonged to the genius of Celtic and Frankish liturgical developments to multiply ceremonies and prayers, and to pile up every influence which could be regarded as a source of sanctification. It was the most natural thing in the world for those who were already familiar with the ritual for the dedication of a church to judge that the washing with water specially blessed for the purpose was the divinely-ordained means of driving out the spirit of evil. Such washing with blessed water, more particularly when mixed with salt, was conceived of as a process of moral disinfection. In the rite for the dedication of a church there is first of all an elaborate compounding of this hallowed water with multitudinous prayers, and then the whole church is drenched with it inside and out. Nothing can be plainer than the intention of sweeping and garnishing an abode in which holy influences may afterwards be brought to dwell. It is only when the powers of evil have been put to flight by this process of washing, that the consecration proper begins. And how is this consecration symbolized and made eloquent to the spiritual sense? There can be no hesitation about our answer. It was by the use of oil, typical of the richness of God's benedictions and associated from the earliest times with the operations of the Holy Ghost, that the idea was portrayed of God's taking possession of His own to dwell within it and to communicate to it every kind of spiritual efficacy in what is attempted for His service. Thus we find that the process of cleansing which takes up the whole of the first part of the ritual for the dedication of a church is followed immediately by a service of anointing—the unctions being applied not only to the altars, but to the walls of the building. Exactly the same thing happens in the rite for the

blessing of a bell. The simple *Exorcismus* of the early Spanish form is followed by the equally simple *Benedictio*. In the Frankish and Celtic developments these two elements are maintained as clearly as before, but they are respectively reinforced by washings and by anointings, by symbolism in fact of a most speaking kind. That the unction was introduced primarily on account of the analogy with other solemn consecrations, such as those of churches, altars, chalices, &c., is very clearly conveyed in the prayer itself—"ut cum praesens vasculum, *sicut et reliqua altaris vasa*, sacro chrismate tangitur, oleo sancto ungitur,"¹ &c.

Hence there is every reason to believe that the washing also was originally inspired by no other feeling than that this symbolic purification was the proper and traditional antecedent of that bestowal of consecration and virtue typified by the unction. Moreover, in this way we come to understand how the unctions are, so to speak, the climax of the service. No "form," as we have noticed, accompanies the washing. But the words which are used with the anointing seem to suggest a quasi-sacramental efficacy.

So far, I think, we are on safe ground. But how comes it that as early as the time of Charlemagne the idea had apparently established itself that the blessing of bells was a sort of baptism and an unbecoming parody of the sacrament? Charlemagne, it is not disputed, enacted in his Capitularies that the baptism of bells was not to be permitted (*ut clocae non baptizentur*). It would take long to discuss the various explanations that have been propounded of this obscure ordinance. I must be content here to recall the view suggested, if I remember rightly, by Binterim, that the Emperor was condemning, not the ritual familiar to us in the early Pontificals and long since adopted by the Church at large, but only certain superstitious developments of that ritual which really converted the blessing of bells into a parody of baptism. It must be admitted that this is only a conjecture and not an explanation established by evidence, but there is much to recommend it. We do not know when the practice of naming bells began,² but if, as is quite possible, it began in the eighth century, we have at once, as the ambiguity

¹ From the prayer—"Omnipotens sempiterne Deus qui ante arcam foederis," &c., *Egbert's Pontifical* (Surtees Society), p. 118.

² Baronius attributes it to Pope John XIV. c. 973, but on no serious grounds. The practice of dedicating bells to a saint is likely to have followed rather closely on the practice of dedicating churches and altars.

of our English word to *christen* shows,¹ a point of departure upon which a misinterpretation of the washing ceremony might be founded. Anyhow it seems undoubted that certain ill-instructed people did come to look upon the blessing of bells as a sort of baptism or christening; and we may be quite sure that once the idea had taken on there would always be people who would have bad taste enough to think that the more nearly they copied the actual ceremonies of baptism the more solemnity they were adding to the consecration of the bell. If I am right in my interpretation, the ordinance of Charlemagne was aimed at some such abuse, and it did have a great effect in checking extravagant developments. In point of fact there seems to be hardly one of our surviving Pontificals of France, Germany, or England, in which the ritual for the blessing of bells affords any reasonable excuse for regarding it as a parody of baptism. In every case the "form" of the sacrament seems to have been respected, but it is true that the use of godfathers for the christening of a bell was common, though they seem to have done no more than shout its name and hold the cord by which it was suspended. Again, in certain localities the bell after the ceremony was covered with a white dress, a sort of chrisom cloth,² and what was even more significant, we find that here and there the name was given to the bell *sub trina infusione aquae sanctae*, *i.e.*, while water was poured on it three times.³ But I repeat that these were all exceptional usages, which were not recognized in Rome, and which it would by no means be fair to say were accepted by the Church at large. Indeed after long search I had begun to think that I should be justified in saying that no single instance was known in which the "form" of baptism was parodied in the blessing of a bell.

This, however, would not be quite true, and I venture to call attention here to a consecration of bells which belongs to an

¹ In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, lay-folk were taught that in case of emergency they should baptize a child in the following words, "I christen thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

² There is no mention of godfathers or of chrisom cloth in the York Pontifical. In the Sarum it occurs at the end of the whole service, thus: "Deinde aspergatur aqua benedicta et totus populus praesens. Et imponatur sibi (*i.e.* the bell) nomen per sacerdotem, apponendo manus supra et simul imponunt patrini et matrinae. Et post presbyterum nominant suum nomen, cooperiendo cloccam linteis."

³ See, for example, MS. Cotton, Vitellius, E, xii., which though for the rest identical with Hittorp's *Ordo Romanus*, adds the rubric: "Tunc sub trina infusione aquae sanctae impone ei nomen si velis." Henderson, *York Pontifical*, p. xxvii. But note that this comes quite at the end of the ceremony, when the ordinary rite is over.

extremely scarce ritual of the diocese of Cologne, printed in the year 1500. It is very interesting, though I may say at the outset that it never seems to have received any proper official authorization. I give the more material part of it in spite of its length, for the existence of such rites undoubtedly helps to explain the violence with which the Reformers of Germany wrote on the subject.

THE MANNER OF CONSECRATING BELLS.¹

The people are reminded that they must behave devoutly and that the godfathers must be present. The bell ought first to lie with its head towards the east, and the priests should be vested in albs with a stole, and salt and water should be blessed as the custom is. And let them put in that water a small phial of spring water and [some] of the ashes of the boughs which were consecrated on Palm Sunday. And with this water no one ought to be blessed, but let it be kept for the bell.

At the procession, let the choir as they move forward with the Sacrament, and relics, the standards and the cross, sing the Responsory, *Benedic domine domum istam*. When this is over, let the seven Penitential Psalms be read, and the psalm [71] *Deus iudicium tuum regi*; the psalm [66] *Deus misereatur*; the psalm [99] *Subilate*; the psalm [84] *Benedixisti*; the psalm [148] *Laudate dominum de celis*; the psalm [*i.e.*, the Creed] *Quicumque vult*, with the litany. And when he comes to the same place, &c., then is said, *Ut campanam istam nomini tuo preparatam benedicere et consecrare digneris. Te rogamus*, &c., and this three times. Which done, the four gospels are read, that is to say, the four beginnings which are read at the obsequies of a priest, &c., and when this is over, let the exorcizing of the devil take place as in the case of children, and the godmothers (?) must answer the name of the bell.²

Oratio.—Deus abraham, deus ysaac, deus jacob, deus qui moysi . . . angelum tuum ut similiter custodiat et hunc vasculum (*sic*).

Ergo maledicte diabole da honorem deo vivo et vero et recede ab hoc vase N. Quia eam dominus et deus noster iesus Christus ad suam gratiam et gloriam vocare dignatus [est]. Et hoc signum Sancte crucis quod nos fronti eius damus (that is to say on its cannons [pendiculis] inside and out) tu maledicte nunquam audeas violare. And then three times :

Exorciso te immunde spiritus in nomine patris ✠ et filii ✠ et spiritus ✠ sancti ut ex eas et recedas ab hoc vasculo N., ipse enim te imperat maledicte dammate qui pedibus supra mare ambulavit, et petro

¹ From the *Agende in Catholicis ecclesiis observande*. Cologne. 1500.

² "Et respondeant patrine (*sic*) nomen campane," but it is *patrini* (godfathers) at the beginning.

mergente manum dexteram porrexit, iesus christus dominus noster qui venturus est iudicare, &c. Ergo maledicte, &c., as above.

Deus cæli, deus terræ, deus angelorum, &c. . . . te invoco domine super hanc campanam ; Per, &c. Ergo maledicte, &c., as above.

Then let him say *Pater noster*, *Credo*.

Then let the consecrator be girded with a linen apron round his loins and let him take holy oil and make a cross upon the bell at the four corners low down, and a fifth by way of a *bonne bouche* (*in loco pulmentarii*), and let him wash the place with a brush (*et abluit cum scopula locum*) and let the godmothers (*patrine*) keep the cords extended outwards through the ears.¹ Then let the bell be so placed that it hang a little above the ground. And let the consecrator say, 'What do you wish to call her?' Then let the godfathers answer N.² Whereupon he says :

Et ego te N. baptiso in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti, ut sis ad laudem omnipotentis dei, matrisque sue gloriose marie virginis ac omnium virtutum celorum, et humano generi tam corporis quam anime remedium sempiternum. Amen.

Then let him take chrism and make a cross with it externally upon the ears of the bell, saying :

Et ipse dominus noster iesus christus te liniat crismate salutis ut salutem corporis et anime per te percipere mereamur. Amen.

And then let the bell be washed all over with simple holy water and wine, and let it be dried with clean cloths, and then let it be fumigated with the thurible, and let the priest say :

Sit vasculus (*sic*) iste domine iesu christe tibi in laudem et odorem suavitatis acceptus nobis ad salutem, quod nobis prestare dignetur pater et filius et spiritus sanctus. Amen.

And let the godfathers wash and give alms. And then shall be sung *Te Deum Laudamus*, with *Salve Regina*.³

Here, then, I shall be told, the protest of the Reformers is fully justified. Some justification undoubtedly there is, but it is also abundantly clear that these extravagances were not in general use, and I do not believe them to have been sanctioned even in this case by any responsible authority. In the first place the officiant is assumed to be a priest and not a bishop, and this undoubtedly contradicts the principle more generally received and acted upon throughout Christendom. It was one of the grievances of the time in Germany that the auxiliary bishops who performed these functions extorted such large fees. Again, the Latin of the document abounds in blunders, and

¹ "Et patrine teneant cordulas extendentes foras in aurículas."

² Et dicat consecrans 'quam vultis eam nominari?' tunc patrini respondent N.

³ Schönfelder, *Liturgische Bibliothek*, i. pp. 99, 100, &c. Paderborn, 1904.

seems never to have been revised. It is impossible to believe that these confused functions of godfathers (*patrini*) and (?) godmothers (*patrine*) represent anything that really happened. Further, this form for the blessing of a bell is found in only one rare edition of the Cologne Ritual or "Agenda,"¹ an edition which appears to have been a matter of private enterprise. Nothing of the sort is discoverable in the two other early editions, one printed twelve years earlier, the other twenty years later. But perhaps the strongest evidence of all is the fact that the Protestant controversialists of the sixteenth century were content to go to the *Pontificale Romanum* to justify their attacks. If such forms as that just quoted were printed and in common use, they would surely have been much more extensively appealed to by the ardent assailants of Popery.

I may say further that though the *Centum Gravamina*—"the hundred grievances"—of the German Nation include a protest against the baptism of bells, the ceremonies used in such functions did not by any means constitute the chief object of complaint. It may be interesting to translate this particular section of the *Centum Gravamina*.² As will be seen, it is directed mainly against the action of the auxiliary bishops, who as a rule officiated on these occasions.

Moreover, these auxiliary Bishops (*suffraganei*) have started the idea that they alone and no other priest should baptize bells for the laity. Accordingly, simple folk believe, at the suggestion of these auxiliaries, that the bells which are so baptized can drive away devils and storms. Wherefore there are generally a whole crowd of godfathers; and people of means are more particularly invited to fill this office. Their duty is during the ceremony of the baptism to touch the cord with which the bell is tied, and when the Bishop auxiliary gives the cue (just as is done in the baptism of infants) they all answer together and shout out the bell's name. So also the bell is clothed in a new dress just as is done for a Christian. Afterwards they all sit down to an expensive dinner, to which the godfathers in particular are invited that they may offer gifts more generously, while of course the auxiliaries and their chaplains feast right royally. Neither is this enough, but there is a big fee to be paid to the auxiliary which they are wont to style a *douceur* (*munusculum*). In this way it happens that even in small towns as much as a hundred florins are expended upon a baptism of this kind. All which is not only superstitious, but is contrary to the Christian

¹ I have not seen this *Agenda* of 1500, which does not exist at the British Museum. I quote only from Schönfelder's reprint.

² Leprat, *Monumenta Concilii Tridentini*, vol. ii. p. 186, § 51. The *Gravamina* were drawn up in 1523 and sent to Adrian VI.

religion, and is mere extortion. However, the Bishops, that they may line the pockets of their auxiliaries with any kind of fee, however shameful, tolerate all this, and even things more absurd. A custom, therefore, so disgraceful and objectionable deserves to be abolished altogether. Still, if it be thought fitting that bells should be consecrated—for that is the term which the auxiliaries use of this baptism whenever they are questioned by more intelligent people—it is desirable that this consecration should be performed by any simple priest in the manner in which it is wont to be done, with holy water, salt, herbs, and suchlike things, without any charges and expense to the laity, that the simple people may not be deluded and fleeced, and that all suspicion of detestable avarice be avoided.

In 1536, the *Centum Gravamina* were referred at Rome for the consideration of the two Campeggios and they were asked to report upon them in writing. Their report has been printed in modern times, and it may be interesting to notice the comment made upon article 51 just quoted. In their reply as actually sent in, the Cardinal and his brother observe

51 In the blessing of bells these extravagant (*superflue*) ceremonies and expenses must be done away with entirely, and the employment of auxiliary bishops is an abuse.¹

Moreover in a first draft of the document which has also been preserved we find a somewhat longer criticism, which runs thus:

51 The pious belief (*credulitas*) of the faithful that demons and tempests are driven away by the sound of a bell is not altogether to be reprehended since by the Church's institution this is what Bishops pray for in blessing it. But we must condemn the idle superstitions and the ceremonies which have been introduced through an abuse and which were by no means instituted by our forefathers.² Extravagant expenditure is also to be banned and measures must be taken to prevent the auxiliary bishops from making a mercenary profit out of the holy ceremonies of the Church.

Whether the Reformers achieved any real or lasting good by their violent crusade against the baptism of bells is not obvious on the face of things. Even so sound a Protestant and ardent a campanologist as Dr. Raven appears to have his doubts. As a conclusion to this paper I cannot resist quoting a passage

¹ See Friedensburg, *Nuntiatuerberichte*, Abtheilung I., Bd. II. (1892), p. 405.

² This is also the substance of the explanation given in the decrees of the Council of Cologne, 1536, part ix. § 14.

from his recent, and, unfortunately, posthumous work on the *Bells of England*:

All [*i.e.*, the ceremony of the blessing of bells] was swept away, to be revived in a new and exceedingly mundane form, thoroughly characteristic of the Georgian era. My old friend Gatty describes it as it was witnessed in his parish of Ecclesfield:

"Two wagons, decorated with boughs and evergreens, and drawn by teams of grey horses bedizened with ribbons, set out for the merry peal, and returned in the fine afternoon with their welcome load. The shouts of the multitude greet their arrival, and at the ancient public house on the village green the procession comes to a stand. Then commence the profane christenings. In one of the bells, which has been inverted for the purpose, mine host mixes a motley compound of beer, rum, &c., which is liberally dispensed to the good-humoured bystanders. The bell-founders' representative is busy on the occasion, and in the Treble has a more delicate mixture, from which he offers a libation to the more distinguished persons of the company."¹

The "spirits" which Englishmen of the Georgian era believed in were perhaps more real but hardly more productive of culture and civilization than those that were exorcised in the "baptism" of bells.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ *The Bells of England*, p. 321.

The Society of Jesus and Education.

[The series of papers of which the following is the sixth was originally delivered to an audience of Jesuit scholastics at Stonyhurst. This will explain and must excuse their exhortatory tone. They are made public in the feeling that they contain matter which may be of interest to a wider circle of Catholic teachers.—Ed.]

VI. IN THE FACE OF OUR TIMES.

WE come now to the more particular application of all that we have hitherto been saying. Before doing so let us try to sum up the impression left on the mind by a careful study of the writings of the Jesuit Fathers on educational matters before the framing of the *Ratio Studiorum*. It may, perhaps, be put as follows :

From the beginning those of our Fathers who were appointed by Superiors to the work of education recognized the power of the weapon they were handling, and the strength that was theirs to use it to good purpose. They had gone out into the world of heresy and corruption to see what could be done for the glory of God and the benefit of mankind. They found both heresy and moral corruption debasing education to their ends ; making it their slave on the one hand, and falsifying standards of morality on the other. Being educated men themselves, and a match for any rival, they soon discovered where their true vocation lay. It lay along the line of exposing error, of saving learning from adulteration, of turning the moral tide that threatened to engulf it. The importance of the task became apparent in many different places, and to many individual Fathers, each seeking that which he might be best able to do. One by one they accepted what Providence set before them ; and at once, by individual, disunited effort, much was done. How much more, they began to reflect, might be accomplished by the united energy of the whole body to which they belonged ?

But that this might be secured there was need of strict internal regulation. There was need of a formal acceptance of

education as a distinct work of the Society. There was need of method and order in studies. There was need of some guarantee of freedom from error, and of thoroughness in doctrine, among themselves; something that would make the Society itself sure of its own orthodoxy, and something that would give right-thinking men confidence in it as a teacher of truth. If these could be secured, then they had the world of education at their feet. Nowhere else, in any University, Catholic or Protestant, could so combined a power in education be brought forward. They would have professors drawn from all the world at their command. They would have the experience of every centre of learning, not of this or that isolated University. They would be able to distribute their forces at will, to concentrate here, to relax pressure there, without being confined by local restrictions or by a handful of men from whom to select. Thus they would become independent of all Universities, independent of the very world of learning itself; even while they served both the one and the other, as no other servant served them. Having despoiled the Egyptians they would use their spoils in the Egyptians' own interests. They would be a University in themselves, materially scattered it is true, but none the less formally united; and rendered only the more powerful, only the more effective, by this their international and world-wide experience.

This was the dream in the minds of one and all of the pioneers of Jesuit education, at which they hint in no doubtful terms. They had made up their minds "to conquer the land of the infidel;" and they set to work about it without equivocation. It was an ambition that suggested endless power, that is true; and it is no wonder that students of history, who fail to understand, or who refuse to give full credit to, the inner spirit of self-renunciation that inspired the men who worked it out, see in it the boldest stroke to secure complete control of civilization that has ever been attempted in the history of the world. In one sense it was, no more nor less; in another sense nothing was farther from the minds of the conspirators. They aimed at securing control, not of the temporal power of the world, but of those inner forces that went to make up human life. Of the material body of humanity they made less account; what they looked for was the purifying of its blood. This is stamped on every page of their preliminary writings. They wished to regenerate the world; regeneration must begin

with reform in morals and in thought; morals and thought could be reformed, with hope of lasting effect, only in the centres of learning. Morality in discipline, depending on a regular system; morality in teaching, depending on a trustworthy master; morality in practice, depending on an up-growing youth that had been taught self-respect, reverence for its fellow-men, and high ideals of ambition;—this was the basis on which they began to build. And from that as a beginning they looked to the end. They hoped by this means to elevate the moral condition of the age; they hoped to wrest from heresy, and then to turn against it, the weapon it was arrogantly claiming as its own; they hoped to win back to the Church her lawful empire; and they hoped, moreover, as they stated again and again in their private memoranda, to give to every country that received them subjects more worthy of the name, and with a higher sense of justice and honour, as its servants and its defenders.

Lastly, one cannot help observing what very modern men, in many ways how very like ourselves, these early Jesuits were. In our time the Society has been accused of being too utilitarian in its views and its methods; of making sacrifice of means too precious for the particular ends it has in view. That it is utilitarian we need not fear to acknowledge; utilitarian in this sense were the earliest schoolmasters of the Society. But that the means sacrificed are out of proportion to the end,—that will depend on the value we set upon the end itself. If it be but the supporting of some minor work, then the criticism may be justified; but if the minor work, on another ground, becomes of capital importance, then it may be that no means will be too great to be sacrificed in its favour. Such was the difference with which the first Fathers viewed their work as contrasted with the men who criticized them; and in a like sense such is the difference to-day. They had a particular outlook; it was, we trust, very much like our own. They had a particular ambition; we may hope that our own is the same. They had at hand a particular material, and they set to work to use it; to use it up, if need be, there and then, suffering the future to take the consequences; just as among ourselves to-day we see the Society using its material very much as it comes to hand, and trusting to Providence to provide it with more when the present supply is exhausted.

These, then, seem to have been the ideas which actuated the

men who first built up the Society's education. That education was of gradual development, but once it began to develop it came rapidly to perfection. Since then it has undergone many changes. Time, and circumstance, and rivalry, have made sad havoc with its system. Nevertheless, it is to be hoped, the spirit that inspires it is the same; and the aim of these lectures has been to help us to see in what that spirit consists. If, then, one of those early Fathers, or one who had been trained entirely on the system of the *Ratio Studiorum*, were to come here amongst us now, and were to be giving us hints on teaching taken from his own experience, we know he would say much that would appeal to us all. He would hit upon the most important subjects to be noticed. I do not say that his advice would in every case be the soundest. As he walked through our modern schoolrooms he would notice changes from his own time. In some points, if he were open-minded, he would see that we had gone forward; in others there would be evidence of decline. Naturally, then, in the hints he would give, he would dwell most upon this latter; and in what we have said we have tried to express what might be supposed now to strike him from this point of view.

To complete this study there remains one more thing to be done. We have tried in all that has been said to discover the spirit of the Society's education, irrespective of any particular time or place, independent of any particular curriculum, as it should be seen in all its schools and under every circumstance. We have deliberately excluded, except in so far as it expresses that spirit, all discussion of the actual method of teaching as laid down by the *Ratio Studiorum*. We have been seeking not the letter but the spirit; and we have the countenance of St. Ignatius himself favouring us in our search, to whom a rigid formula was unknown, and who expressly lays down, in the Constitutions, Pt. iv. c. 10. decl. A, that adaptability to circumstances and countries, the spirit remaining everywhere the same, should be characteristic of the teaching of his Society. In the article on "Education," written for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Mr. Oscar Browning says of the Society of Jesus:

Whatever may have been the service of Jesuits in past times, we have little to hope from them in the improvement of education at present: Governments have, on the whole, acted wisely by checking and suppressing their colleges. The *Ratio Studiorum* is antiquated and difficult to reform.

If the charge implied in this statement contained a single grain of truth, then would the Society of Jesus have cause to hang its diminished head; for whatever else might be said in its favour, the conclusion would be justified that it had betrayed the spirit of its Fathers, had lost that adaptability which St. Ignatius supposed would ever be its chief characteristic, and was turning to vicious account the enormous power for good which it possessed in its individual members. Whether or not, in matter of fact, the actual work of the Society of Jesus, in England, and still more abroad, gives ground to modern educators to assert that "we have little to hope from them in the improvement of education," it is not for us to decide. This, at least, we may say; that to identify the spirit of the Society with the *Ratio Studiorum*, and to involve both in the same condemnation, betrays a fundamental misconception both of the one and of the other.

On the other hand it must be allowed that the misconception is easily to be explained. Not only outside the Society, but even within its ranks, the tendency to identify the *Ratio Studiorum* with the whole sum and substance of the Society's education is not altogether unknown. In matter of fact it was no more than a brilliant attempt to adapt the machinery of the Society to promote the best interests of learning at a particular time of the world's progress; its very *raison d'être* implied the duty of every succeeding generation to watch the face of the times in which it lived, and to adapt itself accordingly.¹

¹ Since these pages were written, the Decrees of the last General Congregation of the Society, held in the autumn of last year, have been made public. The bold attitude of the Congregation towards the education problem seems certainly to be the most striking feature of these Decrees. Hitherto, in every Congregation since the Restoration, a desire has been expressed for an attempt to be made to bring back, or to re-write, the *Ratio Studiorum*. This the last Congregation has deliberately acknowledged to be impossible. It has recognized that the time has come to decide between the letter of the *Ratio* and the spirit of St. Ignatius, and it has decided in favour of the latter; the former is to be preserved and studied, not so much as a working system, but as a system which contains the best general expression of the teaching spirit of the Society.

1. "As to the demand of several Provinces," says the Congregation, "that a new edition of the *Ratio Studiorum* should be produced, considering the times in which we live, and the variety and unsettlement of school regulations and systems, the General Congregation is of opinion that the work can scarcely be attempted. . . .

2. "Moreover, since it has to be confessed that not even the new *Ratio Studiorum* edited by Father Roothaan can at the present day be sufficiently followed, and since the difficulties and requirements of one Province are altogether different from those of another, Provincials . . . for their respective Provinces . . . shall decide on the course to be adopted.

Hence in an examination of the teaching of the Society of Jesus, especially with a view to its practical application, it becomes essential to keep in mind first the evils of the day, against which it is a professed counteraction; and secondly, the system or systems of education in the country where it is at work. As for the latter of these enough will have been said already; in any case, its discussion scarcely comes within the scope of this paper. Even for the first there is room only for a word, and it is this: If a Jesuit master would do his work efficiently, besides his classics and his mathematics, besides his examinations and his successes, it is well that he should come to understand, and endeavour to keep before his eyes, the main drift of the evil influences which are at work among the people of which he and his boys are a part. Living as he does in their midst, and compelled to think their thoughts, it is obvious that he, and still more his boys, need to be awake to any danger. In proportion as his training is opposed to these influences, in such proportion is it a success; very much more than if he only succeeds in passing examinations. In proportion as it neglects these influences, and even carelessly encourages them as of little or no moment, or as a necessary condescension to the needs of the age, in such proportion there is reason to fear that in the end his teaching will prove hollow.

For this reason I take it to come within the scope of these lectures to say one last word on the spirit of England to-day, not from any observation of my own, for that would be worth very little, but from the evidence of thinking men who are keenly alive to the welfare of the country. I do not quote to suit my own purpose; I am only taking the witness of men

3. "But in making their decisions consideration must be had, as is fitting, first of all to that end which the Society proposes to itself in founding its colleges; which is not only that the faculties of our scholars shall be developed by the most suitable methods, but also, and more than all else, that they should be trained in fidelity, and reverence, and good morals, that they should be accustomed to discipline, and that they should learn to act on principle. . . ."

Finally the Congregation adds as to the subject-matter of the modern curricula:

4. "What concerns the subject-matter, the Congregation is of opinion that the study of the classics should be promoted with all care, inasmuch as they are the means by far the most suited to a true training of the intellect; but, on the other hand, that non-classical schools are by no means contrary to the Institute, and, wherever either local requirements or great advantages demand it, such schools may and ought to be erected, so long as care is taken that classical studies do not suffer on their account."

The whole tone of the Decrees breathes this same whole-hearted determination to accept, as far as possible, the best of the new as well as of the old.

who have a right to be heard ; and if we are wise we shall surely do well to bear in mind what they say.

I begin with the words of one who has recently made a careful study of the Industrial Efficiency of England, Germany, and the United States. The result of his study appeared in two volumes last spring ; the impression, therefore, is that of Englishmen to-day, and is formed after mature and deliberate observation. He sums up his study as follows :

England is like a composite photograph in which two likenesses are blurred into one. It shows traces of American enterprize and of German order, but the enterprize is faded and the order muddled. They combine to a curious travesty in which activity and perseverance assume the expression of ease and indolence. The once enterprizing manufacturer has grown slack ; he has left the business to take care of itself, while he is shooting grouse or yachting in the Mediterranean. That is *his* business. The once unequalled workman has adopted the motto : "Get as much and do as little as possible ;" his business is football or betting. . . . Everyone is bent on pleasure and amusement. That is the universal business. No one is in a position to abuse the rest ; they are all in the picture, and wear the same expression, from top to bottom of the social scale. Not every individual, of course, but every class. We are a nation at play. Work is a nuisance, an evil necessity, to be shirked and hurried over as quickly as possible in order that we may get away to the real business of life—the golf-course, the bridge-table, the cricket and football field, or some other of the thousand amusements which occupy our minds and for which no trouble is too great :

It is not necessary [he goes on] to labour the case. Since I began this investigation the broad facts of the situation have become widely recognized, and what was thought three years ago to be an amusing paradox is now reflected as sober truth in every newspaper. This autumn [he is writing in 1905] many leading journals have published long and severe reflections from many correspondents on the national failings, which save me the trouble of arguing the point at length. I will take the liberty of quoting a few samples ; and as others see us better than we see ourselves, I will give precedence to the candid foreigner.

An American, Mr. John T. Taylor, of New York, writes in the *Daily Telegraph* :

"And right here I will state my conviction as a soldier, a surgeon, a sociologist, and a student of history, that however bad your War Office and Army are (and I admit they are both very bad), yet the vast majority of the people of Great Britain are very much worse than either—and they are still rapidly declining in all the vigorous virtues of true manliness.

"The plain truth is the English are suffering from the diseases which arise from excess and immorality. . . . These diseases produce that weakness of mind, that childishness, from whence arises the love of games and horror of work which distinguishes the modern Britons from their grand and noble ancestors, whose daring and independent spirit was superior to that of any other nation in the world. . . . To waste and want are now the leading characteristics of the majority of Anglo-Saxons."

A "Russian of Position," signing himself "E. O.," writes in the *Pall Mall Gazette* :

"But, I repeat, it is too late for you to take any action that will save your race from speedy extinction, because during the last thirty years the English people have become mentally, morally, and physically rotten to the core. . . . I knew England well during my mission here between 1870 and 1879, and by recent examination I find there have been stupendous improvements in all the conditions of life of the working classes, and of the very lowest classes also; yet the physical and mental debility of the English and their criminal depravity are quite three times worse than they were thirty years ago.

". . . And yet your politicians, pseudo-philanthropists, and parsons of three hundred sects, pander to the masses by telling them that their diseases and distress are not caused by their gross immorality, idleness, and extravagance, but by conditions which can be cured by charity or Acts of Parliament." . . .

The writer of the book quotes other writers, all of the same date, and all bearing the same witness. He then sums up for himself and his readers :

These extracts, which are merely samples from masses of recent correspondence, refer to more than industrial efficiency, but the moral is the same. In every branch of human activity work *is* efficiency, and we play more than any other people of the same standing.

And immediately afterwards he goes on :

Life is easier here, much easier, in spite of American wages; as for Germany, there is no comparison. And under these easy conditions the Gospel of Ease has permeated the nation, and has been preached from every pulpit and every platform. This is what is called "Progress." Sir William Harcourt, in the last public speech he made, put the truth in these words: "The object of the party of progress is to make life easier and more comfortable for all classes." That is so. Politicians compete with each other in promising it, "reformers" demand it, statisticians prove it, parsons rejoice over it, and newspapers applaud it. "Easier and more comfortable;" what an ideal! Comfort is the greatest good, hard work is an evil, discipline degrading, sacrifice a monstrous thing, suffering not to be thought of, and if duty entail these things, then away with it. Let us all be easy and comfortable.

Such is the judgment passed upon what may be called the material side of the English people to-day ; and, allowing for all exaggerations and prejudice, no fair-minded critic of our times will deny that the portrait it paints is true. On the religious and moral side the picture is no more assuring. Judgments in plenty might be quoted ; the recent struggle in the country for and against religious education has brought them out in abundance. One or two examples will suffice. In the course of last year the *Hibbert Journal* contained many an article dealing with the subject, written by men who from their position and experience must be held competent to judge. First we quote the evidence of the Headmaster of Eton. Discussing the question of the teaching of the Christian Religion in schools, he opens with the following significant, and to us almost despairing, introduction :

We must define what we mean by the Christian Religion before we make recommendations as to how it is to be taught. And to make clear how necessary this is, I will try to enumerate, but not exhaustively, the principal meanings attached to the expression when it is considered in connection with education :

(a) Some parents care in reality for nothing but good moral teaching for their children. They believe also that it is a perilous venture teaching a child anything so deep as religion, and so they forbear from touching the subject : but none the less they habitually speak of moral teaching as if it were the same as religious training.

(b) Others, and these are a very numerous class, care mainly for morality ; but under the impression that a child cannot take in moral teaching without religious associations, they advocate for their children an experience similar to their own, viz., a routine of conventional form, Bible teaching, prayer, church-going, &c., but all strictly with the aim of helping to produce good conduct. Then, when habits of respectability get to be formed by about twenty years or so, they are quite content that religious habits should gradually be discontinued, as now they often are.

(c) Others, again, put religion first, meaning by the word an implanted sense of dependence on a personal and beneficent God. They have a conviction that if this be secured, conduct may be left to take care of itself ; but they do not advocate religious training for this reason, but merely because it is for the honour of God.

In the same spirit writes Sir Oliver Lodge :

It seems quite unlikely [he says, evidently without any fear of contradiction] that any large number of parents are anxious for their children to have special, as contrasted with general, religious education.

In fact the chronic complaint of those who profess themselves anxious for each parent to be amply provided with his particular religious colour, but have no religion at all, that they are quite careless, and too easily satisfied with anything or nothing.

Still more emphatic is the declaration of Dr. Forsyth, Principal of Hackney College. In his usual trenchant style he writes :

Concentration is in the air. For one thing, we feel the lack of it in various ways. What is the cause of the moral and spiritual uncertainty which the more positive Churches try to make good by dogmatism? It is the irresolution of the public mind. It is a moral lack, the want of will, the lack of concentration, of the moral concentration involved in faith. The tap-root of uncertainty is generally irresolution somewhere. I wonder how many of the public, even of the Christian public, who have come to deny or ignore such doctrines as an atonement, ever forced themselves down to the New Testament in a thorough way. People complain that the religious ground is unsure who had never compelled themselves to examine it with a tithe of the care spent on a contract ; but they have taken current suggestions in a dreamy and hypnotized way. They will not attend, they will not force themselves to attend, gravely to the gravest things. They scatter their interests with indiscriminate impartiality over the wide field of modern knowledge. They read everything in a vagrant, browsing fashion. They turn on the most serious subjects the holiday, sea-side, newspaper habit of mind. They admit the subjects are momentous, but they do not treat them so. They do not own the authority of such subjects to compel special pains towards certainty about them. If a preacher fall into this frame he may coo over the people the balmy optimism of a natural and unconscious Christianity which makes no call upon the will for positive belief, but delights those who are only at the æsthetic stage of faith and life. Is it not the case that most doubt on religious matters is listless and not vigorous, discontented rather than negative, vague and not positive? Is that not the fashion of the whole agnosticism which has replaced the old atheism? So that one is grateful to find a vigorous, serious, and informed doubter, with whom something can be done because he begins with a serious concentration on the objects of his criticism.

Again, the same writer :

How very many cultivated Christian people have no idea what they are in belief! And how many of these, again, do not know how ignorant of their ignorance they are! We are often invited to let learning alone, and produce more practical ministers and clergy. Have those who talk so any idea of the extent to which practical activity covers intrinsic bewilderment among Christian people? This active conscience is a

frame of mind that must tell upon our Churches both in pulpit and in pew, that reduces both to a sympathetic brotherhood of uncertainty and incapacity before the problem of the world; that robs the Gospel of authority, the pulpit of moral dignity, and the people of the guidance to which they are entitled; that lowers insensibly the tone of our communities, and allows the meaner interests to raise their head; that deprives the Church's word to the world of weight and power, and that casts the public for guidance upon the publicists and litterateurs. It moves the centre of gravity from the mind and conscience to the energies and sentiments. And, however harmless that transfer might be in some cases, in the case of a religion which is nothing if not the regeneration of the conscience it is a very ominous thing.¹

Lastly, let us quote a passage from that shrewd little book, *The Letters of John Chinaman*. This is the way "John"

¹ In the midst of this pessimistic outlook, it is pleasant, particularly for Catholics, who make so much of what they call the religious atmosphere, to hear another headmaster of a well-known public school advocating as essential to true religious and moral training the preservation of this same atmosphere at whatever cost.

"Though," writes the Headmaster of Bradfield, "I touch but on the fringe of a great subject, and though it may well be said, 'Who is sufficient for these things?' yet this paper would be incomplete if I were not to add that all these aids to religious education in our public schools are after all adventitious aids. The chapel with its sermons and its services, the lecture-room with its more dogmatic exposition of the Eternal Verities, are but the rains and the sun, which though they encourage, yet have no power to fertilize the seed of religious life in the character of the public school boy without that subtle thing called the 'atmosphere' [I forbear to use the cant word "tone"], which seems to be formed from the breath of boyhood in the aggregate,—an atmosphere differing widely in one such community from that in another, and yet altering very little from one generation to another when once it has been inspired; a something wholly defiant of analysis, and yet a something absolutely traceable in the character of those souls that have lived in it and passed through it.

"Thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth."

"But one thing is certain, that this atmosphere, by its very closeness, makes or mars the souls that have to breathe it. It is more penetrating, more permeating than any of the causes named above, which yet, in some subtle, chemical way, help to compose it. But it is far more potent than all put together, because it extends beyond the chapel and lecture-room to the hall, to the field, to the chamber, to the study, and away through the school gates to the great highway of outer life.

"And when it is remembered that the community with which this paper has dealt, is composed, not of a loose aggregate of social units that meet for a chance moment to part the next, but of individuals who live a very close co-operate life, eating the same bread, working at the same tasks, playing the same games, thinking the same thoughts day after day for months together,—a community, finally, of immature minds, receptive of impressions to a degree almost beyond belief, with characters formed with incredible rapidity for weal or woe,—how is it possible but that an overwhelming responsibility should rest on the shoulders of those who are called upon to organize the systematic life and to direct the thoughts and energies of such a society? Must not men in such a position of rule and service be potent factors, whether for good or ill, in forming the 'Oversoul' of the institution in which their work lies?"

describes the impression produced on him by the religious and moral condition of England :

When I review my impressions of the average English citizen, impressions based on many years of study, what kind of man do I see? I see one divorced from Nature, but unreclaimed by Art; instructed, but not educated; assimilative, but incapable of thought. Trained in the tenets of a religion in which he does not really believe—for he sees it flatly contradicted in every relation of life—he dimly feels that it is prudent to conceal under a mask of piety the atheism he is hardly intelligent enough to avow. His religion is conventional; and, what is more important, his morals are as conventional as his creed. Charity, chastity, self-abnegation, contempt of the world and its prizes—these are the words on which he has been fed from his childhood upwards. And words they have remained, for he has neither seen them anywhere practised by others, nor has it ever occurred to him to practise them himself. Their influence, while it is strong enough to make him a chronic hypocrite, is not so strong as to show him the hypocrite he is. Deprived on the one hand of the support of a true ethical standard, embodied in the life of the society of which he is a member, he is duped, on the other, by lip-worship of an impotent ideal. Abandoned thus to his instinct, he is content to do as others do, and, ignoring the things of the spirit, to devote himself to material ends. He becomes a mere tool; and of such your society is composed. By your works you may be known. Your triumphs in the mechanical arts are the obverse of your failure in all that calls for spiritual insight. Machinery of every kind you can make and use to perfection; but you cannot build a house, or write a poem, or paint a picture; still less can you worship or aspire. Look at your streets! Row upon row of little boxes, one like another, lacking in all that is essential, loaded with all that is superfluous,—this is what passes among you for architecture. Your literature is the daily press, with its stream of solemn fatuity, of anecdotes, puzzles, puns, and police court scandal. Your pictures are stories in paint, transcripts of all that is banal, clumsily botched by amateurs as devoid of tradition as of genius. Your outer sense as well as your inner is dead; you are blind and deaf. Ratiocination has taken the place of perception; and your whole life is an infinite syllogism from premisses you have not examined to conclusions you have not anticipated or willed. Everywhere means, nowhere an end! Society a huge engine, and that engine itself out of gear! Such is the picture your civilization presents to my imagination.

So effectually does irreligion sterilize itself, in body, in mind, in soul. It saps the very life of a man by indulgence; it has no ideal to offer that will stir a noble thought; depriving the soul of its lawful object of worship, that soul must needs be

devoted to the worship of itself. Seventy years ago a great prophet foretold the evils that might befall the land if it continued in its course of irreligion. That prophet's name was Newman. As a great man will, he saw the spirit and the tendency of his time; he took alarm at the movement; he denounced it with all the vehemence of his oratory. His denunciation won him fame among men, but he made little of it; he preferred the lesson which the danger taught him, and that was a greater security of faith. Though praised and honoured by men, his prophecy fell on deaf ears; he was heard as a modern Cassandra. Nevertheless, his words have come true; and the spirit of the century described in his pages is not the least of the good things he has left us. The evil effects are on us now, but the sufferers still persist, either in not seeing them at all, or in acknowledging no connection between effect and cause. To do so might be inconvenient. It might convict them of a mistaken judgment; it might also point to a remedy which at present does not suit their palate.

Much more might be quoted to the same effect from writers of to-day, whose interests are keen, and whose eyes are wide open to what is going on in England. All alike cry out against the decay of faith and religion in every class of the community, and against the general luxury, idleness, and loss of moral influence, which follow as a necessary consequence. The picture of their times and the evils that were in it drove our first Fathers to adopt education. Opposition to those evils, more than any scholastic ambition, gave the tone and colour to their teaching; and if we are to take up education and to carry it on, in the spirit of St. Ignatius and his companions, it is as needful to study these portraits of our times as any examination or university syllabus. The further conclusion is obvious; that in proportion as descriptions such as we have given apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to our boys, in such proportion, whatever other success may be ours, is there something wanting in our Jesuit education as such.

With this let us conclude. In these papers we have tried to express the spirit which underlies much detail in the Society's system of education; that spirit which should be one and the same at every time, in every country, and under every condition. We have tried to say what St. Ignatius, or Laynez, or Ledesma might be supposed to have said had they been here amongst us to-day, and had they spoken, not as saints exhorting to virtue,

but as simple promoters of education. If St. Ignatius were alive to-day, what would be his attitude in regard to education? Would the name of Loyola, let us say of Leeds, be one which would in time come to be added to those of Arnold of Rugby, or Thring of Uppingham, or Almond of Loretto? It might indeed be so; but it would be with a difference. He would advance his school; of that there can be no question. He would have learning raised to its limit of perfection, no matter what it might cost him. He would enter into competition, since that is the spirit of the time, and he would secure examination successes; by no other means did he compel recognition in the University of Paris, the centre of education in his day. He would be keenly alive to every educational movement. He would be quick to learn from, and adopt what was good in, the methods and experiments of others; this, and nothing else, is the story of the evolution of the *Ratio Studiorum*. In all this he would not differ from any other devoted headmaster; and the casual looker-on, even the casual school-inspector, might notice nothing more in the spirit of the man and of his school. But to the close observer, still more to the boy who had come under his influence, most of all to the generation which came after, and could judge of his work by its results, something else would be noticed that went deeper down, and more materially affected the making of a man. There would be discovered to have been at work the mind of one to whom education, as men usually understood it,—accumulated learning, examination successes, the production of a typical man of his age,—was very far from being the goal of his endeavours. To many his spirit would appeal as painfully utilitarian. He would turn out the best results—that could not be denied; but he would do so, not because of any value that the thing possessed in itself, not merely that it might become a matter of admiration, of advertisement, of material influence, not even in the interests of education as such, but simply that it might serve the better to secure some further end in view. Men might condemn him accordingly as a pseudo-educationalist, as one who made a mere handmaid of learning, and who had not its real interests at heart; yet in the end it would be found that precisely because of this further object, to which all else was made to bend, he had given an education in effect with which no other could compare.

May it not be with us the same? We, Catholic educators,

whether we like it or not, are of necessity a class apart. We demand of Catholic parents that they should entrust their children to us, and that at no small expense to themselves, and at the cost of no small sacrifice of the worldly prospects of their children. To justify our demand it is obvious that we must have something to give them in return; something of which we claim to possess a monopoly in the educational market. In many other matters we may be behind our rivals. Our means may be less abundant; our material less select; the bait we have to offer less attractive. If, then, our aims are merely to produce what is being every day produced by countless educators around us, with all our many disadvantages, and with all our unavoidable limitations, we must be hopelessly beaten. At best we must be simple imitators and no more; and when the dissatisfied Catholic parent asks for a reason why he should be at such trouble to procure for his son what may be equally procured at less expense elsewhere, we shall have nothing but generalities to give him in reply. But, so long as our aims are higher, so long as our nobler ideals are kept well in view, so long as our teaching of grammar, and mathematics, and history, does not stop at an examination, but reaches forward to the years beyond, inspires a spirit that will last a lifetime, above all instils that faith which, more than anything else, it is our profession to instil, so long we shall be conscious to ourselves that we possess a power which to others is wanting. With this power behind us we can face any criticism. What is more, with this power to support us there can be no doubt—as our rivals themselves have more than once acknowledged—that we can hold the field and win battles for the Church as St. Ignatius and his companions won them of old.

ALBAN GOODIER.

Catholics and the Pronunciation of Latin.

THE recently-issued *Report of the Twelfth Annual Conference of Catholic Colleges upon Secondary Education* makes it clear that the question of the pronunciation of Latin will soon have to be faced by Catholics, not as a subject for academical discussion, but as a matter of immediate and practical importance. At their meeting at Ushaw in May the Catholic headmasters decided to memorialize the Board of Education and to point out the difficulties which would ensue were the new scheme of the Classical Association which the Board has adopted to be enforced throughout our schools. The reply of the Board, which is printed in the *Report*, shows that the educational authorities are not inclined to reconsider their position, and that they will not go beyond the concessions already made in their circular, to the effect that,

if the authorities of any school recognized by the Board still prefer to adopt a system of pronunciation other than that outlined in Circular 555, it is open to them to do so, but their scheme must be clearly explained when the curriculum is submitted to the Board, and in no case can the use of any system be sanctioned in which proper attention is not given to quantity.¹

The last few words should give us pause. For whatever be the extent of variation in our pronunciation of Latin, in our disregard of quantity our unanimity is wonderful. True, in words of more than two syllables the penultimate is treated with a certain amount of respect: we distinguish between *decōre* and *decōre*, *condītus* and *condītus*; but in any other syllable a difference of quantity is not adverted to unless there is an obvious contrast to be accentuated. Thus, in the well-

¹ *Report of the Twelfth Annual Conference of Catholic Colleges upon Secondary Education*, held at St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, May 14th and 15th, 1907, p. 69.

known *Cane decane*,¹ apart from the exigencies of scansion, careful enunciation of quantity is necessary throughout in order that the meaning may be apparent, but in our ordinary use of the language we make no difference between *ōs* and *ōs*, *menss* and *menss*, *pōpulus* and *pōpulus*, *nōmini* and *dōmini*. It is not, however, intended to discuss here either the nature of the distinction between long and short syllables or the best way of reproducing it in spoken Latin; our point is that whether the difference be one of true quantity (that is to say, a difference of time taken in uttering the same sound), or one of quality (that is, a difference in the sound itself), some change will have to be made in our method of pronouncing these vowels, and that this change will make it advisable to consider whether our whole system of pronunciation should not be put under scrutiny with a view to the attainment of some sort of unity. It is true that a great number of our secondary schools are independent of the Board at present, but one cannot prophesy how long this immunity will continue. But even so, educational bodies such as the Benedictines, the Oratorians, and the Jesuits, who have some schools entirely independent of Government, and others either in receipt of Government help, or likely to become dependent upon it in the near future, will be compelled to choose between using different pronunciations in different schools and adopting a new system throughout; and if a large number of Catholic colleges make the change, our want of unity will only be accentuated unless the Catholic body as a whole is prepared to conform.

Supposing, then, that we cannot remain where we are, in which direction lies the most promising path of reform? Our answer to this question must depend on the object for which we intend to use our Latin. And it is at this point that we have to part company with those whose interest is limited to the purely educational and literary aspect of the question. Latin is to Catholics not merely a subject in a school and university curriculum, not merely the medium in which the noble thoughts of a great literature are expressed, but it is above all things

¹ *Cane decaue, canis*; sed ne cane, cane decaue.
De cane: *de canis, cane decaue, cane.*

A modern translation runs:—

Good dean Grey, the sportsman's lay
Ill becomes thy tresses grey;
Grey-haired Grey, thy theme be, then,
Not greyhounds, but grey-haired men.

the official language of the Church, the living tongue by which her children of all nations are in communication with each other. Hence, whereas correctness and certainty¹ are the watchwords of the "restorers," our first postulate is that any new scheme of pronunciation which we may adopt shall be intelligible to Catholics in other countries. Correctness, indeed, in the pronunciation of a foreign language is an excellent ideal, but without the living voice as a standard it is impossible of attainment. As Dr. James asked, when the question was brought up at the Headmasters' Conference last year,

how near had they got when they had formulated these opinions and made them into rules, to the real pronunciation of Latin as they might suppose it to be? How near could they get to the pronunciation of a modern language, say of modern French or Italian, by the help of directions in a book? The pronunciation of a language was a matter very largely indeed of intonation and accent, it was not concerned exclusively with the sound of the particular consonants and vowels.²

If, however, correctness fails us, mutual intelligibility may not prove so delusive a spectre: indeed, any English Catholic, unless he happens to use the modern English pronunciation, can make himself understood abroad without great difficulty; but one cannot help thinking that more remains to be done in the way of facilitating this intercourse, and we should keep this in mind in considering any scheme of reform. It is almost a platitude to say that where the written symbols and the meaning are the same in two countries the intelligibility of the spoken word will be the greatest when every symbol has the same value in each. Thus *hospes* is pronounced in much the same way by French, English, Germans, and Italians, whereas *infans* has one sound in French and quite another in German. We should, therefore, so far as possible, use sounds which can be understood by our Continental neighbours. At the same time, for the sake of unity, we should try to establish a standard pronunciation among ourselves so that a foreigner may be able

¹ *How to Pronounce Latin.* By J. P. Postgate. London: George Bell and Sons, p. 3. "The champions of the new pronunciation take correctness as their principle. Latin, they say, is a foreign language, and should therefore be pronounced as it was by those who spoke it, if their pronunciation can be ascertained." *Ibid.* p. 5. "In the first place [a scheme of reform] must be reasonably certain. In other words, it must recommend no change in the existing pronunciation for which there is insufficient evidence."

² *Report of the Headmasters' Conference, Malvern College, 1906, p. 31.*

to apply not a personal, but a national equation when our Latin differs from his. For this is what really happens when Latin is used as a means of oral communication, as any one will agree who reflects upon his own experience. An Englishman cannot understand French Latin unless he has become used to the *nasalités* and the narrow *u*, nor German Latin until he learns to recognize the hard *g* and the diphthongs *oe* and *eu*. In these cases we know what to expect and can make allowances accordingly. But the foreigner is not so lucky in his intercourse with Englishmen. No one can say *à priori* how an Englishman will pronounce his Latin: indeed, so great is the prevailing chaos that at the meeting of the Classical Association held at Manchester last October one of the speakers was moved to say: "There are no two schools in England, I believe, which pronounce Latin in the same way."¹ This stricture, which we must take to be a pious exaggeration, falls less heavily on Catholic schools than on others; but, as has been said, there still remains a good deal of unnecessary variation which we may hope to get rid of in the near future. Why, for instance, should it be possible to hear *tertius* pronounced *terssiuss* in one schoolroom, *terttiððss* in the next, and *tertsiððss* in the chapel? Why write *caelum*, say *saylumm*, or (now that the Catholics at the Universities are taking up the modern English pronunciation) *keelumm*, or *seelumm*, and sing *chayloom*? One of our first necessities is, therefore, a system in which every symbol shall have for Englishmen the same definite value and be pronounced in the same way. An obvious but not unimportant corollary is that such a scheme of pronunciation should include no sounds but such as are in use already in the English language, for the sufficient reason that in using their own tongue Englishmen do conform to some kind of standard, whilst their French may cover the whole range of variation between Paris and Stratford-atte-Bowe.

Accepting then as necessary qualifications of any pronunciation of Latin we may adopt, that it shall be intelligible on the Continent, uniform among ourselves, and English in its sounds, let us now consider how far existing systems meet these requirements and whether it is possible to modify any one of them so as to make it satisfactory. If we exclude the modern English system, which no one who had not been brought up in it would care to adopt instead of his own, our choice is limited to three

¹ *Proceedings of the Classical Association*, October, 1906, Murray. P. 56.

methods: the Italian, the Old English, and the "Restored," or "Augustan." Of these, the first is probably the most common amongst English Catholics to-day, though its introduction is comparatively recent. But it is to all intents and purposes a foreign language, and labours under the same difficulties. In the majority of cases we fear that the Latin of our Anglo-Italians would be disowned by a modern Roman. True, there are those who have lived long enough in Italy to have mastered the intricacies of the native pronunciation; but these are few and far between, and the majority of "Italian" Latinists are content to regard a strongly emphasized *ch* as the warrant and sign-manual of their purity of accent.¹ No doubt if the whole Catholic Church throughout the world were to adopt the Italian as its official pronunciation it would be worth while to adopt it in England and to put up with a certain amount of mispronunciation for the sake of a world-wide uniformity. But so long as France, Germany, and Spain retain their distinctive peculiarities based on their own languages, there is no need to ask Englishmen to struggle with a set of sounds to which their organs have not been trained.

The second choice has been described as the "Old English" pronunciation, not because it is known for certain to have been used by our ancestors, but because it is difficult to imagine any other origin for it than tradition. There seems at least good reason to believe that a new pronunciation was introduced at the time of the Reformation,² and the "Old English" may well be the descendant of the system which it was then sought to banish. At present it finds a stronghold in the Jesuit colleges, but has only recently been superseded by the Italian method at Ushaw, and was probably in common use among Catholics before the Italian pronunciation was introduced. Roughly it may be described as a combination of English consonants with Continental vowels—understanding by the latter those vowel sounds in English which approach nearest to the Continental

¹ The Italian pronunciation was advocated as a substitute for the Augustan in a letter read before the Classical Association, but no one could be found to move an amendment to that effect. See *Proceedings*, p. 53.

² *Report of Headmasters' Conference*, p. 44. Dr. Gow's speech: "... There was some reason to believe that the English pronunciation was first introduced at Westminster for a definite purpose. Nothing was authoritatively known about it; but the Dean of Westminster was certainly of opinion that there was a distinct decree in the time of Edward VI. that the Continental pronunciation of Latin should be abandoned in order that English people should not understand the Mass."

values for the same letters. On the other hand it is important to note that the sounds themselves are perfectly English, that is to say, that *ē* and *ō*, for instance, are pronounced as in the marked syllables of *hāle* and *hōle*, not as in the German *nēhmen*, or Italian *Rōma*. The diphthongs *ae* and *oe* have the same value as long *e*. Here then it would seem that we have some promising material to work upon: the sounds are such as we can pronounce without difficulty, they are such as a foreigner will be able to recognize, and finally among those who use them there is, except in one or two small details, practical uniformity. On the other hand the system is not without its defects: there is the neglect of quantity (though this of course is not peculiar to this pronunciation), the confusion of words owing to the same sound representing so many different symbols, and at present the added grievance of internal inconsistency. The combination of "Continental" vowels with English consonants might well be adopted as a workable system and one which would not be inharmonious; but the anomaly of retaining the emphatically English sound in so important a vowel as *u* is fatal to consistency and euphony alike. Indeed there are few now-a-days who, even if they use the English *u* in speaking, are bold enough to retain it when singing. Only those who have heard the English terminations relentlessly rendered in the "*Tantum ergo Sacramentum . . . sensevum defectevi*," or in the "*Ego sum*," of the Passion, or in the ordinary termination "*per Dominum*," &c., can realize the supreme ugliness of the English *u* in combination with the Continental vowels.¹ It is an obvious grievance and one easy to remedy: we have only to substitute the Continental *u*, which is represented in English by long and short *oo* (as in *fool*, *foot*), and to make some distinction of quantity, and we have a system of vowels which should be fairly satisfactory. The consonants we may leave for the moment.

There remains the "Restored" Pronunciation, the panacea for all our ills, the remedy for all our discord, the great transcendental force that is to merge all our dialects and differences in the higher unity of pure Augustan Latin. The movement for

¹ If a classical test is desired, let the reader try to extract the honeyed sweetness from *perpetu'cuna* in Catullus' lines:

Soles occidere et redire possunt;
Nobis cum semel occidit brevis lux
Nox est perpetua una dormienda.

reform has its origin in the dissatisfaction of scholars with the modern English pronunciation: they perceived how unintelligible this was to any one who had not been brought up in it, and being unable to find a satisfactory and consistent substitute in the multitude of existing pronunciations, they determined to effect a radical reform, and to return to the Latin of the Augustan era, so far as its sounds could be ascertained. The result of this reform was the syllabus drawn up by the Committee of the Classical Association. There is no need to give full details here of a scheme which is already well known;¹ suffice it to say that it has received the approval, expressed always by a large majority and sometimes unanimously, of many learned bodies, including the Classical Association itself, the Headmasters' Conference, the Headmasters' Association, and the Assistant Masters' Association. The Committee of the first-named body, in the report adopted by the whole Association, "appeals to all classical teachers in the United Kingdom to adopt the method of pronunciation here set forth."² We cannot therefore neglect it as a mere whim of its promoters: it is a serious attempt to change the Latin pronunciation of all Englishmen, and though it was not designed expressly with a view to superseding the pronunciations in use in Catholic schools, it is bound to affect them if it spreads at all widely.

The attitude of Catholic educational authorities towards the new pronunciation is not quite clear, and it is to be regretted that the report of the discussion on Father Norris' resolution at the Ushaw Conference is not fuller. The impression is that the "restored" pronunciation is regarded as a sort of Dr. Fell, an object of instinctive aversion: at least this would seem to be the implication of the President's remark that "they were all agreed in disliking the new pronunciation, though there was some divergence as to the reasons to be adduced."³ The divergence was apparently so great as to make it impossible to include any of the reasons within the limits of the *Report*, and one is left to conjecture what they may have been. In default of accurate information, it may not be unfair to suppose that

¹ It may be found in the *Proceedings of the Classical Association*, 1906, p. 75, or in the *Report of the Headmasters' Conference*, 1906, Appendix H. The best short account is Professor Postgate's *How to Pronounce Latin*, already referred to.

² *Proceedings*, 1906, p. 69.

³ *Report*, p. 69.

Catholics share to some extent in the objections which are commonly urged against the new pronunciation—that it is unintelligible, impracticable, and so forth. Something also must be allowed for the *vis inertiae* which resents change of any description; but since we started with the supposition that change of some sort was inevitable, this consideration cannot be allowed to weigh heavily. Intelligibility we have already postulated as our first requisite, so that if the new pronunciation cannot stand this test it must be unhesitatingly condemned. But has the case against it on this head ever been clearly made out? Is there any evidence brought forward of men who find no difficulty in understanding Continental pronunciations, yet cannot converse in Latin with a "Reformer"? The question is surely one for personal investigation, and it seems hardly fair to prejudice it until a reasonable amount of testimony has accumulated on one side or the other. What is wanted is some more records of personal experiences such as that of Professor Postgate and his German friend, who "found to his surprise, avowed without hesitation, that he had at last met an Englishman who could talk Latin intelligibly."¹ So again, when we ask whether the "restored" pronunciation is a practicable one, we must beware of basing our answer on impressions and prejudices rather than on facts. Now the facts of the case are that the pronunciation has already been adopted, and is now flourishing in several schools,² so that the possibility of its introduction is proved beyond a doubt.

Nevertheless Catholics may consider the change involved in the introduction of the new pronunciation too great to be desirable. For while the reformers are in the happy position of men who, whatever innovations they introduce, cannot change their subject for the worse, Catholics, on the other hand, who have, as we have seen, a fairly intelligible system or systems

¹ *How to Pronounce Latin*, p. 13. The only instance which has come within the writer's experience was a Latin scene acted by boys who had not had sufficient time to make themselves perfect in the new pronunciation. Acting, of course, calls for especially clear enunciation, and this may have been the reason why their Latin, in spite of occasional lapses into the pronunciation which they normally used, was perfectly easy to understand.

² *Proceedings of the Classical Association*, 1906, p. 49: "An inquiry addressed by the Assistant Masters' Association last year to some one hundred and four schools elicited the fact that no less than thirty-four regularly employ the restored pronunciation; ten employ both styles, the old and the new; while the majority of the staff in twenty-three out of the sixty that at present employ the English pronunciation are in favour of reform."

among them, may be content to arrive at unity among themselves by less drastic methods. No doubt we shall thus incur the anger of the reformers by rejecting their ideal of a uniform pronunciation for all Englishmen, but we may answer that to us unity among Catholics comes before uniformity among Englishmen, and that we should like to have more assurance of the ultimate realization of their ideal before we attempt to conform to it. But the same speaker who gives the statistics of the schools in which the new pronunciation is used, admits in the next few sentences that "the great public schools are hard to move, and the preparatory schools are consequently at present bound to the English method," though he is confident of a successful issue. Meanwhile the names of Dr. Rendall of Charterhouse, Dr. James of Rugby, and Dr. Gow of Westminster, who all spoke at the Headmasters' Conference in opposition to reform,¹ deserved to be weighed rather than counted, and their attitude may give reason to think that the future of the new pronunciation is less rose-coloured than it is usually painted.

There is perhaps more chance of coming to a definite conclusion for ourselves if we take the vowels and the consonants of the new system separately. The resolution of the Catholic Headmasters says that the "traditional use among Catholics . . . already employs the proposed vowel sounds."² It would be more accurate to say that it employs some of them, and that there is no reason why it should not employ them all.³ For the vowel sounds of the new pronunciation—and the fact is worth emphasizing—are all English, and therefore able to be uttered without difficulty. From this point of view it is interesting to compare the scheme of the Classical Association with the scheme on which it is undoubtedly based, that, namely, of the Philological Societies of Oxford and Cambridge.⁴ The changes made are slight but significant. Compare for instance the directions for the vowels *ē* and *ō*—

Philological Societies' scheme :

ē (*mēta*), as German *e* in *nehmen*, not as *ee* in *mēet*.

ō (*nōtus*), as Italian *o* in *Rōma*.

¹ *Report of the Headmasters' Conference*, pp. 28, 31, 44.

² *Report of the Twelfth Annual Conference*, &c., p. 70.

³ The exceptions are *a*, *ū*, *ū*, and all diphthongs except *au*.

⁴ *Proceedings*, &c., pp. 69, seq.

Classical Association scheme :

ē (mēta), as *a* in mâte (Fr. é as in blé), not as *ee* in mēet.

ō (nōtus), as *o* in nōte (or nearer Italian *o* in Rōma).

In other words the Classical Association goes out of its way to assign a purely English sound to a vowel which the Philological Societies had considered incapable of being so represented. Evidently then it would be possible to adopt the system so far as the simple vowels are concerned. There remains of course the difficulty connected with the diphthongs *ae* and *oe*, which are to be rendered by pronouncing the first vowel in each pair long, and following it by short *e*, the equivalents given being

a+*e*, nearly as *ai* in *Isaiah* (broadly pronounced), Fr. *émaîl*, not as *a* in *late*.

o+*e*, nearly as *oi* in *boil*, not as *ee* in *feet*, nor as *a* in *late*.

No doubt the "nearly" will be disregarded and the two sounds will become in the end the English *ai* and *oi*. Now putting aside questions of convenience, in which the new pronunciation brings an undoubted gain, and of euphony, in which there is no more than a doubtful loss, it may be contended that these sounds are possible and intelligible—more intelligible, certainly, if pronounced carefully as *a*+*e*, *o*+*e*,—and one would like to insist on this pronunciation were it possible—but intelligible even when given as *ai* and *oi*. The ultimate proof of this contention must rest on personal experience; but the frequency of *ae* as a termination should make its recognition easy in the body of a word, while *o*+*e* is not very far removed from the German *oe*, at which no one cavils. And even with the most English of vowels what can *poinai*, for instance, be taken to mean except *poenae*? And if *poinitet* is not *poenitet*, what else can it be?

Lastly, a word must be added on the consonants of the new scheme. These differ more widely from any Catholic pronunciation than do the vowels, and may consequently be expected to give rise to more controversy. The values, for instance, which we attach to *v* and *j* always, and to *c*, *g*, and *t* in certain positions, differ radically from those which they have in the new pronunciation, whilst in the case of *b*, *r*, *s*, *x*, and doubled consonants, the variation, though not so great, is nevertheless appreciable. But while we have insisted on the necessity for

unity of vowel sounds, the necessity for a similar unity in the consonants is not so pressing. For the fact is that it is much easier to recognize a consonant than a vowel: "*veni, vidī, vici*" is not more unintelligible as "*weni, widi, wiki*," than when rendered according to any of the Continental systems: it is only when we change the vowels and say "*veen-eye, vide-eye, vice-eye*," that the difficulty occurs. If, therefore, we can secure mutual intelligibility by a uniform pronunciation of the vowels without insisting on an equally uniform rendering of the consonants, it is not worth while making difficulties about the latter until there is greater certainty as to the ultimate success of the restored pronunciation. At the same time, since the consonants of the restored pronunciation are (with the exception perhaps of the trilled *r*) all sounds familiar to English ears and tongues, there will be no difficulty in adopting them should occasion arise. Further, for the benefit of those who think that their introduction will cause misunderstanding, it may be pointed out that with the exception of *c* and *v* (or consonantal *u*) all these sounds are found in one or other of the pronunciations in use at the present time—*g* in Germany, *t* in Ireland, *b, j, r, s, x* and doubled consonants in Italy and elsewhere. As for *c* and *v*, the latter will easily be accepted as a consonantal *u* when *j* becomes consonantal *i*, while the former will justify itself on grounds of convenience and simplicity. An argument from particular instances in such a case is perhaps nothing more than a piece of special pleading, but Professor Postgate's examples deserve to be quoted if only as a counterpoise to "*Kikero*"—a word which in the eyes of many is sufficient by itself to condemn the hard *c* without further hearing.

[The learner] will leave "*fashio*" "*fesi*" "*faktum*," and go back to "*fakio*" "*feki*" "*faktum*," with one sound instead of three. He will no longer wonder helplessly why *replĕo* should make its participle *replisitus*, and then syncopate to *repliktus*, nor *abdeucy* (*abduce*) by the simple loss of an *e* transform itself into *abduck*.¹

The conclusion, then, that suggests itself is that we should make an effort to secure uniformity in our vowel sounds by adopting those of the restored pronunciation, but that the consonants, as being of less importance and more likely to cause disagreement and difficulty, should be left untouched

¹ *How to Pronounce Latin*, p. 12.

until the vowels have become established, and until we see whether the whole scheme is likely to find universal acceptance. It has already been pointed out that some divergence of opinion was shown at the Headmasters' Conference, and in this connection it is worth noticing that Mr. Fletcher of Marlborough, in introducing the motion, said that

he would modify his motion to any extent in order to secure some measure of agreement, even if they stopped at uniformity in the case of the vowels. He would be prepared to limit the proposal to the pronunciation of vowels, which seemed to be the point in which there was the greatest difference in the various stages of a boy's education.¹

Should this uniformity be secured, it will still remain open to us to take up the question of consonants at a later date if need arise. Meanwhile, though personally in favour of the adoption of the Classical Association scheme *in toto*, we feel that in the case of so wide a reform, Catholics, who are already able to understand each other, should not be called upon to make a great change unless they are agreed upon its necessity, and reasonably sure that the new pronunciation they adopt will not itself have to be immediately thrown aside.

I. C. SCOLES.

¹ *Report of the Headmasters' Conference*, p. 26.

Gathered by the Way.

I LIVE in a little town where there are many gardens ; almost half the year we live among flowers. To-day all who walk to the station pass clumps of Annunciation lilies not a yard from the pathway. I have seen a boy behead one with his stick. Outside the town there are beech-woods in which one may wander for hours alone ; there are meadows, and narrow, grassy lanes with flowers in the hedgerows. People do not observe these wonders—they see them so often ; it is not worth the least effort to go and wander beneath the green of the beech-woods in spring-time, the gold in the autumn. But when a circus comes and pitches its tent in a meadow, turning the turf into black and slimy pulp—when dingy beings in dingier raiment parade the streets on spiritless, tired beasts, making sad the heart of the observer, the people run out to see the unwonted sight. Strange blind beings are we that we neglect the common beautiful, and are all agape for the unlovely if it be unusual. A field of buttercups God-made we pass through unheeding ; were it strewn with artificial flowers many would be found to walk a mile to see the sight. I want to tell, to those who have ears to hear, of one or two common flowers of life I, all unworthy, have gathered in passing.

One evening at dusk in the winter, as I passed by a cottage, I saw on the door-step at play a little girl with her tinier brother. They were not pretty children, they had straight dark hair and pale faces. There came along to the lamp, which stood at the edge of the path not far from the children, the lamp-lighter. No thing of beauty he, but dirty, unshaven, and surly. Click went the clasp of the lamp and up shot a pale yellow flame. The plain little girl looked up and looked pretty, for a smile of pleasure illumined her face. "Thank you for lighting the lamp," she said, then went on with her play. The lamp-lighter smiled and passed on, for a moment transformed and pleasant to look at.

One night last summer a little Italian girl of four died here. Her name was Rosina Rappaccini, but at school they called her "Rosie Organ." In a tiny cottage in our dirtiest, narrowest street she died at midnight—on a bed, above the head of which were pasted, on the whitewashed wall, innumerable "holy" pictures, many of them cut out of books and papers. Rosina had played near some drain, I suppose, had contracted enteric fever; and her parents, ignorant beyond measure of symptoms of illness, of treatment and precautions, had called in the doctor too late. When they learned that death was near, the mother wept aloud, the father raved, so that the neighbours heard and gathered round; and one, hearing that the priest was wanted, fetched him. Before he came the little soul had gone away; he found the little body cold and white. The mother lay upon the bed, her black hair streaming over her shoulders, her eyes red with weeping—glistening with tears in the candle-light, kissing again and again the little dead mouth, calling her little daughter back in soft sweet sound. Full of dignity was this Italian mother, a work of the Great Artist's infinite good taste to all seeming, beautiful to look upon, with music coming from her lips. A neighbour, kind-hearted enough to come and offer help, a buxom, good-tempered, prosaic soul, said: "If you keep on pulling her about she'll turn black."

For some days the organ did not go out; the little dingy room was resplendent with candles and many paper flowers. For the funeral people turned out as for a circus. The father talked to his dead child in soft tones; the mother, still calling her back, weeping aloud, flung herself down in the long grass. Showers of large white sweets and of coins were flung on the little coffin by the father and a fellow-countryman; the crowd, trampling on mounds and flowers, pushed aside the mourners to look into the grave and see all that could be seen.

And every Monday night, when the organ in its round plays near the churchyard, the faithful mother goes—with a child, perhaps—its hand in hers, to Rosina's grave. For a long time she wept aloud at every visit; then she grew quieter; and now she kneels at the grassy mound a little time in silence, while the organ incongruously rattles out a tune from the music halls.

There is an old, old tower hanging over the river here. It was built in Norman times of white, hard chalk. A little time ago they took from its face the stucco a tasteless generation

had smeared it with, restoring to it much formerly-hidden beauty. How many hundred years it has stood and watched the river! and it looks as if it had a spirit of its own to observe and understand. It has a friend—a neighbouring abbey, and together they have watched the changes. They have watched monks in the abbey garden, stately processions, buryings without number, weddings; how many thousand, with their different longings, coming to Mass and Vespers! priests carrying Communion—Viaticum to the sick and dying, with the flicker of a lantern borne before, the tinkle of a little bell. They have watched “reform” in religion, thrusting forth of monks, breaking and burning of things sacred. The old tower has watched nave and chancel fall to decay, patched, restored in deformity; its own nobility marred with stucco. It has seen its friend the abbey almost destroyed, in part rebuilt, become the residence of a wealthy family; lights have glittered from the windows late at night, there has been dancing in what was once the refectory; men, and women in soft, pale dresses, have wandered together by the river in the moonlight. The sentinel, with changeless vigilance, has watched Shelley floating in his boat near by as he wrote one of his poems; it has watched the floating beer-shop of our own time, with its crowd of degenerate humanity. Its bells have made music through the ages, mingling with solemn chant, with sighs of mourners, song of birds, with Shelley’s song, and the song of happy, triumphant youth; unchanged when there was laughter not of God, unholy jest or drunken song. It has watched patiently, its dignity undestroyed even by stucco, and will watch. It is not disturbed when men do foolish things; it looked wondering, calm contempt when one day some fool, lost to all reverence, shot an air-gun at its walls from a passing boat. It seems to say: “I wait and watch in peace. God’s plans will be worked out. Truth and good will triumph. Seeing but a square inch of an infinite plan, thoughtful men are sometimes troubled. My foundations are too deep in faith for aught but peace and patience.”

H. S. SQUIRRELL.

Faith in Being.

FOR him who regards the possession of the truth not simply as the satisfaction of an intellectual need, not as a relief from labour and doubt alone, still less as the triumph of a party, there is more of profit in one Catholic book of prayers than in many volumes of polemics. If such a one will leave the dusty arena of controversy and will watch that quietly in practice and action on which, in theory, he has spent so much energy and anxiety, it should not be long before he find himself contrasting the new vision with the old as noonday with the grey of dawn. Doubtless he will find in the book many phrases which, standing by themselves, might excite either his hostility or his derision, but he will quickly understand that on the lips of those who use them they imply an untroubled faith in the highest of mysteries, and an easy confidence in their presence which must at least command his respect even while it passes his understanding. For there is not one petition for grace, not one act of sorrow or thanksgiving there but has its pedigree reaching back unbroken to those first days of revelation when the Son of God was among men as one of them, and taught them to pray with Him to His Father and theirs. There is not one among these pages which does not suppose a full, undoubting acceptance of all those dogmas and beliefs which he would perhaps seek to distinguish and refine, to approve in one age and condemn as outworn in another, to refer to a department of reason, or science, or feeling. He will understand, too, from the first, that the Church will admit no one to pray with her unless he will also believe with her, and that he cannot believe with her except he believe all. The utmost she will have him accept is also the least. The burden is on him, for herself she has nothing to fear. She bears about her all those marks which reason itself would demand of such claims as hers. She can point to her unity, to her legitimate descent from Christ through the Apostles, to her diffusion unchanged through

all ages and nations, to her sanctity of origin, of government, and of aim. To her alone can the name of Church be applied univocally. She is not one of many, contending with rivals on a common field. She can have no rival. She is not a party, or a school, or a system. She cannot be classified. She exacts unqualified submission from her members, and with authority calls upon those who are not of the number to examine her claims and to accept them.

He might, indeed, expect to be repelled by the harshness and arrogance of such an attitude, to be offended by the exclusiveness claimed so unhesitatingly for themselves by persons whom he cannot regard as his intellectual superiors. He cannot be expected all at once to see how different is their whole world from his. But this at least he can see, that truth, like purity, is necessarily intolerant, because its very existence depends upon its being just one particular thing and nothing else: and that any addition to it, or any subtraction from it, changes and therefore corrupts it. Hence there is in the worship of a Church which pretends to the possession of the complete truth, a certain rigidity and intolerance which at first sight shocks one who is not of her congregation, and must indeed continue to be a scandal to him until he has grasped the full meaning of her claims and has rightly appraised the value of her teaching. But the honest seeker after truth may well ask why, if he must lay aside his own beliefs as of duty and listen with an open mind to those of the Catholic, the Catholic in his turn should not act in similar manner towards him. And is he to be blamed if he cannot see immediately that the grounds of his assurance are to the bases of that Faith as the relative to the absolute: that where he thinks, the Catholic knows? The process seems to be the same in both cases. If he profess a faith that contradicts the faith of the Catholic, he is equally ready with him to give an account of it. He says, "I believe," and the Catholic says, "I believe." Wherein lies the strength of this man's right over his for an impartial examination, for a mind open to conviction, prepared if need be for retraction?

We might answer by an appeal to history, by showing how what the Church holds now she has always held, and how, therefore, it is on those who have opposed themselves to her that rests the burden of justifying their position—*edant origines*. Or we might point out that we do not base our faith upon the

conclusion of a syllogism, that our judgment of its credibility and of our obligation to believe in it needs a further ingredient before that belief is made faith: that this ingredient is in us, but not of us, and is addressed before everything to our will. In other words, that our creed is not a list of our private convictions, but a manifesto, as it were, of our position before God and the world, a concise statement of our voluntary profession: and that the certainty which we attach to it is indeed less, as regards our intellectual grasp of it, than the certainty which we have of a mathematical truth, but far greater, or perhaps it would be better to say far higher, in its motive and origin. For it is free, not inevitable: it is a deliberate act of the will, not a helpless automatic surrender of the intellect.

But arguing thus we shall seem either to be merely moving the question further back, or else perhaps to be assuming data of which we can give no reasonable account. And in either case we shall be forced again into that region of controversy from which we are so anxious to escape. Let us look, rather, not so much to the premisses as to the conclusion, and waiving for the time the question of the foundations of the faith, see first the character of that faith in being.

In such a matter as the search for a religion, that is, for a definite position with reference to the end of his existence and the means available towards that end, in which not one faculty alone but his whole being seeks and is to find repose, it is of the first importance that a man should make no false step at the outset, and especially that he should not distort the whole question at issue by limiting it to a single one of its many possible aspects. It is necessary that, as far as may be, he should look at the subject of his study first as a whole before proceeding to its component parts. Let him see first what the Catholic religion does, how it influences its adherents, what sort of place it has in their hearts and mind, how far and in what manner it enters into their lives. And in proportion as his intention is honest and his discernment always clearer, his insistence upon detail will grow less exacting: while the insolence of his intellect, awed by the simple majesty of that living and life-giving faith, will give place to a humility more honourable to it, safer, and more fruitful. To stand before the Catholic religion in the attitude of an anatomist before his subject, to dissect and examine like him from the outside, is to place oneself from the first in an impossibility of ever truly

understanding it. For, unlike an object of physiological investigation, the Church is not a single specimen of an immense class which will yield particular facts to be afterwards generalized and applied to the whole, but it is unique, solitary of its species, ordered to no conclusion beyond itself. And this is precisely what is felt by the Catholic when he reflects upon his religion: who, though he regard each tenet of his faith as essential to it, makes no sharp distinction between them, but sees each in all and all in every one, and cannot examine one without involving the rest.

Thus the task of the inquirer must begin farther back, must start from a more elemental phase than will probably be agreeable to his self-esteem. For it is quite certain that the most formidable barrier between the Catholic and the non-Catholic is one which stands at the very entrance to their argument and is composed of elements too frequently assumed to be common to both, which, in reality, contain in themselves everything that renders mutual agreement impossible. The existence of a visible world subject to law and of an invisible world beyond and above it; the sway of an imperative conscience; even the personality and authority of one infinite God; instead of being points of attachment one to the other may be so many forces of absolute repulsion, hidden because unsuspected solvents of agreement. And the more so because the Catholic understanding of what for the sake of comprehension we may call simply life, or the world, bears at every point some varying resemblance to those other views of the same problem which distinguish those who are not Catholics. And whatever fragments of truth there are that lend to other systems of philosophy a seeming of life, are found unbroken and working in their place in the Catholic religion. Hence there can be no true surrender to the Church on the part of him who thinks differently from her on this one primitive article, the relation of the creature to the Creator: on the meaning, that is, of life, whether in its highest or its lowest forms. The whole body of her doctrine waits upon that. An agreement which does not begin here is no agreement. It is an artificial truce pregnant with disaster. To the Catholic, then, the keynote of life, of life in its widest comprehension, is order: an order implying a worthy end and fitting means to that end, an order which is not nor can be disturbed by any accident, which impresses into its service every mischance, every seemingly fortuitous event of history; an

order which is not inherent in nature itself, but which is the working in time of the eternal volition of one supreme Being. Yet so marvellously does this Almighty Will guide its instruments and accomplish its designs that man, the head and reason of creation, not only appears to be but in fact is unconstrained, free to choose, in the highest sense the architect and builder of his own fortunes. The mystery which reconciles these two contradictories is such as must always exist where the supernatural overlaps the natural and raises it to its own order. But it is the simple, free acceptance of such mystery that saves the Catholic from the fatalism which else might flow from his realization of an Almighty God on the one hand, who can neither repent nor be mistaken, and a material universe on the other, the creation of His hands, ever trembling on the brink of nothing, and only not falling because He who willed that it should stand, wills it still. Whoever talks to the Catholic of chance or accident at one extreme, or at the other of unguided law, blind, unanswerable, rolling on impotent as those who lift vain hands to stay it, wastes his breath on a chimera. In either case he holds but a half-truth: his consciousness reasoning with him that he certainly is responsible for the good and evil in his life, or his hourly observation convincing him that there is a definite, if obscure scheme, underlying all. But his reason unaided is incompetent to link the two together, and so he chooses, and thereby distorts, either the one or the other to his destruction, not seeing that so far from removing the mystery he has but substituted for it an impossibility. Far otherwise the Catholic. He does not, indeed, undertake to prove anything that reason rejects, but he does offer to the world much to which reason cannot reach: and he accepts the mystery, since mystery is of the essence of a supernatural religion.

There is, of course, no question of claiming for the average Catholic an intellectual balance and insight above his fellow-men, or of supposing that the possession or acceptance of the Catholic Faith implies special mental gifts or acquisitions, or that a good Catholic is necessarily a good philosopher. Still, if philosophy is regarded in its proper place as the handmaid of religion, it may be said that in that sense even the unlettered Catholic is a good philosopher, the best of philosophers. For he holds the final answer to all the problems which philosophy proposes,—the existence of a personal God, His creative power,

and His providence. And holds this answer, too, not in any speculative and abstract way, but knit into the very fabric of his being, concrete and tangible in the sacraments and discipline of his Church, voiced in the prayers, public and private, of himself and his brethren, witnessed in the very existence of the mighty body to which he belongs. Strong in our present position, we could afford, were it a matter of our own security alone, to close our ears altogether to the hostile criticisms of our adversaries. Just as we look forward fearlessly to the future of the Church, so we may look backwards confidently to her past, and we shall find our difficulties, our timidity, our apologies, melting away in the overwhelming glory of that pageant. We see her as a pure spirit veiled in a clothing of flesh in which alone have passed those marks of corruption that from time to time have seemed, and barely seemed, to presage her death, while she, the soul, impassible, ever vigorous, shines through remote from any possibility of loss or change. We see her at one time prostrate, wronged and robbed, beaten and left for dead, her power broken, her glory departed, her teaching blown to the winds, and next we see her back in her place unaltered, teaching what she taught before, no less and no more, speaking too as she spoke before, having learnt, it would seem, no wisdom from her late overthrow, no prudence and no humility. We see her defying what are taken to be fundamental laws, that life is change, that truth is relative, that all good contains in itself the germ of evil. For she has grown without changing, and she has preserved, without abating one line of it, her aboriginal teaching both of faith and of morals. And that those into whose hands she has committed her sacred deposit have, in the course of ages, proved themselves at times unworthy of their charge, only serves to throw into bolder relief the mystery of its preservation in spite of all untarnished. No hypothesis will fit, no explanation will explain this unique phenomenon of life, and vigorous, active, progressive life in the midst of death, which does not take into account the divinity of its origin. And even then faith itself may wander and be confused in the midst of so much contradiction unless it sees here, in the life of Christ's Church, an image and continuation of the life of Christ. Like Him she was born among the poor, like Him she has suffered cruelly, like Him she has triumphed in the height of failure, and to-day, still faithful to her exemplar, she is in the midst of the world "standing as it were slain."

It is not to any abstraction that we attribute this life. The Church of which we speak lives in the lives of her members, and in them traces again the life of her Founder. She has besides another life, or rather another aspect of the same life, which is proper to her as a society, as a body of persons bound together in moral unity, and striving, by the aid of a common rule and authority, for the attainment of a common end. And on this corporate life, too, is stamped the same image. So that for us the Gospels are not dead records of the past, but rather guides and prophets of the present and the future, and they are doubly precious to us in that besides an historical and dogmatic significance for all, they have an intimate and personal meaning for each.

It is to such a Church as this, and to no other, that man can give his whole allegiance. But while we say this, we do not commit ourselves to any narrow intolerant view which should cause us to feel self-satisfied rather than confident, or should make of our position of security an eminence from which to look down contemptuously upon those who stray in the plain below. We do not shut our eyes to the working of God's grace in other communions, nor do we refuse to admit the great goodness of many who have remained in them. We are thankful, rather, that the arm of God is not shortened, and that even from the midst of error He can draw truth, and from darkness light. But we are far indeed from thinking that therefore it matters little what creed or system a man follow so that in his heart and conduct he obey the voice of conscience, the non-confessional theology of the upright natural man. For among so many conflicting beliefs it is clear that under each head of difference but one position can be the true one, and it is self-destructive to hold that God, who is the exemplar of all truth in every domain can be indifferent to its acknowledgment, still less to its rejection, in any one. It is hidden in His counsels how far light is given to each to discover the truth, and how far the appearance can, for this or that individual, supply the place of the reality. But still the world of those who believe in a God is divided into two camps: of those whose faith is rock-built because it is belief in what, apart from all reason and feeling, for ever *is*; and of those who, perhaps with an equal personal conviction, embrace as real what outside the consciousness of each may perhaps exist not at all, and whose faith, therefore, totters on the sand, ready to crumble

before the rain and wind. And the effects of so radical a distinction are easy to recognize. For the religion of each will be expressed in their lives, their knowledge of God will be faithfully mirrored in their acknowledgment of Him. The law of prayer and the law of belief will reflect one another, explain and illustrate one another, act each as the touchstone of the other. So that where the perfect truth is, the whole, objective and enduring truth, there too will be the perfect prayer, the clearest, deepest recognition on the part of the creature of all that is implied in the title of his Creator. And this is the heritage of the Catholic, that when he addresses himself to God, he shall do it in words whose context is the whole body of revealed truth laid up for him by Christ in the deposit of His Church: a body of truth which lacks of nothing and to which nothing can be added. However simple and unlettered he be, even though through lack of opportunity or ability to reflect upon his faith he foster here and there a misconception of some point of it, when he falls upon his knees to pray the prayers of the Church his whole soul, all his will and all his desires, are tuned at once in harmony with the faith, the hope, and the charity of those martyrs, confessors, and virgins who from the beginning until to-day kneel beside him with Christ to pray to their Father as He has taught them.

Nor is it only in explicit acts of adoration, thanksgiving, petition, and penitence that the Catholic shows in his life the meaning of his creed. It is even more in the attitude of his mind and will as towards the God revealed to him by that creed, and in his practical expression of that attitude which is its correlative. It is here that Catholic life is unique. In its familiarity with supernatural ideals, its universal application of spiritual standards to the common affairs of life, its easy reference of good and ill fortune alike to the same beneficent source, its practical realization that the visible things of this world are but as a little dust in comparison of the invisible things of the world to come, it stands absolutely alone. The Catholic makes no violent separation between his practical and his spiritual life. For him the two terms are conjugate. The duties and the sanctions of the one flow naturally from those of the other, and he assumes no artificial pose when he passes from the lower to the higher. Religious matters enter as easily into his thoughts and his conversation as do the work, the obligations, and the pleasures of his secular life, for with him

every day, not merely one in seven, is the Lord's Day. Even the most careless of us are heirs to this precious intimacy in the business of God, and it is not until a Catholic has let his soul be chilled in the withering atmosphere of indifference or infidelity that he begins to lose his interest in it. And these facts, mere commonplaces as they seem to us, are indeed so many irrefragable proofs of the truth, the divinity of the Church. No indifference can discredit, no controversy can refute these silent witnesses. A life so true to its profession, and to a profession so clearly divine in its ideals, can itself be nothing less than divine. Nor is it of the least avail to point out that however true this may be of Catholic life in general, it is disproved by the lives of many Catholics in particular. Indeed, the circumstance is an additional testimony to the essential fidelity of the sketch. For no ideal can persist, at least fruitfully, which is disregarded by the majority of those to whom it is offered: and on the other hand, an ideal which survives so much neglect as is implied in the objection, is by the very fact shown to be rooted deeply in the body, as a whole, wherein it is found. And it is true to say that even the careless and evil lives in the Church are of a different type from those outside her—better at once, and worse. For while they have the greater guilt in that they have turned away from the greater good and have sinned in a stronger light, they have yet within them, almost universally, a profounder appreciation of the wrong they have done, more powerful motives to urge them to repentance, more frequent visitations of remorse.

Though the Catholic Faith in being is inseparable from its dogmatic aspect, of which indeed it is the necessary outcome, and without which it could never have been imagined, still it is possible to invert the logical order and to examine one by itself without directly discussing the other. And this is what we would have our friendly critics do. We do not court argument, though neither do we fear it; but rather, to those who seek the Way, the Truth, and the Life, as the brothers sought it by the banks of Jordan, we answer as our Master answered them, Come and see.

R. H. J. STEUART.

William Gifford.

WHEN the vindication of Mrs. Fitzherbert was given to the world recently, the book and its author were made the subject of such a venomous attack in the pages of a journal usually staid and decorous that one writer referring to it declared that the illusion that the brutal days of the old *Quarterlies* had passed could no longer be maintained. We all, no doubt, thought that the spirit that characterized the old *Quarterly* reviews had departed, and we should wish still to cherish the illusion because, like any spirit that revisits the glimpses of the moon, it is sadly out of place, and makes people uncomfortable; but when it was the spirit of its age, in its own environment, it rendered services to literature that we may not disregard.

"At whatever cost of pain to individuals," declared Macaulay, on a famous occasion, "literature must be purified," and in the discharge of what they conceived to be their duty the *Quarterly* reviewers, with Gifford at their head, allowed no feelings of tenderness to stay their hand as they applied the lash or flourished the tomahawk, for these, rather than the blade or the rapier, were the weapons they handled with the most facility. The graces of the critic's art which lighten the strokes of chastening criticism had not come to those who, in guarding the portals of literature, failed to perceive that you can repress with a smile as effectually as with a scowl.

Although Gifford's name has become almost a synonym for literary savagery, his critical severity was less the result of individual temperament than of the times. Literature had not altogether emerged from the arena of partizan warfare, and poetry was reaching a transition period. Not all critics, even in our own day, are endowed with the fine instincts and delicate discrimination necessary to enable them to deal justly with unexpected novelties. It is easy from the vantage ground of to-day to point the finger of scorn at our predecessors in the

field of criticism, because they were insensible to much that is so obvious to us. Their sins of commission were many and grievous, but at least they did not hail as masterpieces each jejune effort of imitative mediocrity. They cared for literature, and strove to keep it elevated and pure.

It will be conceded that occasions arise when criticism in the form of satire proves the only adequate treatment. Such an occasion had arisen when with his *Baviad* and *Mæviad* Gifford, in Scott's phrase, "squabashed at one blow a set of coxcombs, who might have humbugged the world long enough." These poetasters, with their "crude conceptions" and "abortive thoughts," could not survive the ridicule lavished upon them, and soon were heard no more. That Mrs. Piozzi was one of them does not excite our sympathy. She was all very well as the wife of the wealthy brewer who is remembered through Johnson as Mæcenas is immortalized by Horace; but what a falling off was there when, as the arch-priestess of the "Cruscan" school:

Her house the generous Piozzi lends,
And thither summons her blue-stocking friends;
The summons her blue-stocking friends obey,
Lured by the love of poetry—and tea.

With these satires Gifford showed the bent of his mind, so when Canning and his friends embarked on the *Anti-Jacobin*, "the long arrears of ridicule to pay," small wonder that they selected him as pilot.

Bethink thee, Gifford ; when some future age
Shall trace the promise of thy playful page ;
The hand which brush'd a swarm of fools away
Should rouse to grasp a more reluctant prey !
. why so long

Sleep the keen shafts of satire and of song ?
Oh ! come, with Taste and Virtue at thy side,
With ardent zeal inflamed, and patriot pride ;
With keen poetic glance direct the blow,
And empty all thy quiver on the foe :
No pause, no rest, till weltering on the ground
The poisonous hydra lies, and pierced with many a wound.

Under his fearless editorship the wits were free to wing their shafts and launch invectives against whomsoever they chose to regard as enemies, including, of course, all who were not of the Tory faith.

With a talent so pronounced it is hardly surprising that he should have essayed to emulate Johnson, and give English

readers a translation of the whole of Juvenal, a task for which his qualifications as a scholar were counterbalanced by his deficiency as a poet. Scott, who was sensible of its extreme difficulty, pronounced it "one of the best versions ever made of a classical author." It certainly established Gifford's name and rank in the literary world, and he and Jeffrey soon became, in Byron's phrase, "the monarch makers in poetry and prose." Jeffrey might have enjoyed this distinction alone were it not that the "disgusting and deleterious doctrines" of the *Edinburgh Review* so angered Scott that he first ceased to write for and soon gave up reading the "Blue and Yellow;" besides, as he told his brother Thomas, he owed Jeffrey "a flap with a fox-tail on account of his review of *Marmion*." But he did not allow these incidents to break his friendship with the Scottish Voltaire, for, as he good-humouredly told him, he was "not against him personally but against his politics." Scott told his friend, George Ellis, that there was "balm in Gilead for all this," and that the cure lay in instituting in London a Review "independent of bookselling influence, on a plan as liberal as that of the *Edinburgh*, its literature as well supported, and its principles English and Constitutional."

With one accord the editorship was offered to Gifford, who had qualifications other than his reputation as an Archilochus to justify the choice. "His manly wit," said Coleridge, "strong, sterling sense, and robust style in his original works, had presented the best possible credentials of office as *chargé d'affaires* of literature in general."

He has [wrote Scott to Ellis] worth, wit, learning, and extensive information; is the friend of our friends in power, and can easily correspond with them; is in no danger of having private quarrels fixed on him for public criticism; nor very likely to be embarrassed by being thrown into action in public life alongside of the people he has reviewed, and probably offended. All this is of the last importance to the discharge of his arduous duty.

Three years earlier, when the *Lay of the Last Minstrel* was published, Scott wrote to the same correspondent:

I would fain send a copy to Gifford, by way of introduction. My reason is that I understand he is about to publish an edition of Beaumont and Fletcher, and I think I could offer him the use of some miscellaneous notes which I made long since on the margin of their works. Besides, I have a good esteem of Mr. Gifford as a manly English poet, very different from most of our modern versifiers.

Although Gifford did not live to complete the work of editing the dramatists mentioned, he varied his labours during the sixteen years of his editorship of the *Quarterly Review* by the recension and annotation of Massinger, Ben Jonson, and Ford. In freeing their works from the mistakes of previous commentators he reserved all his respect for his author, comment upon earlier editors embodied in footnotes being exceedingly caustic, sometimes, indeed, almost savage, but in many instances, it must be owned, deserved. He loved these old dramatists, and the painstaking care he bestowed upon them was in striking contrast to the surprising looseness displayed by his predecessors.

*Indignis si male dicitur, maledictum id esse dico:
Verum si dignis dicitur, benedictum est, meo quidem animo.*

It was inevitable that the severity of the critical synod, as Coleridge termed it, of which Gifford was *princeps senatus*, should evoke protest, especially from those who felt that their politics were being struck at through their books; but when the excitable and unlovable Hazlitt strove to revile the memory of Pitt, he should have known what to expect, and not cried out when the castigation he had courted descended upon him. There were so many things that the author of the *Spirit of the Age* could have done better, it seems a pity he should have pursued a quarrel to the extreme of injuring his literary reputation. If the victims of critical asperity had the wit, like Lamb, to reply with a pun, they might irritate their tormentor and recover their good humour. If it did not avert another attack, it would at least afford amusement, whereas the quarrels of authors add but little to the gaiety of nations.

The definite purpose for which Gifford had published his satires having been accomplished, he laid aside that weapon, having no desire to "run amuck and tilt at all," like Wolcot, upon whom one almost regrets that he bestowed an *Epistle*, for writers of that stamp have nothing to do with literature, and it only afforded the lampooner an opportunity to retort in his characteristically coarse fashion. This is, perhaps, the strongest argument against personal satire, which soon ceases to interest. Who now reads the *Dunciad*, which once had a wound in almost every line? And if we do not similarly neglect Byron's *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, perhaps it is because, unlike Pope's

deliberate product of nourished hate, it is rather an ebullition of boyish anger, *facit indignatio versum*, relieved by wit, and redeemed by the fact that it provided an opening for friendships that have become historical. As the urbanity that lends dignity to satire could never have come to Byron, it is fortunate that his good sense saved him from wasting his gifts.

Although criticism had not risen out of the region of politics, Byron, notwithstanding his radicalism, was satisfied that Gifford would not be unfair to him. "He won't abuse me except I deserve it," he wrote when his *Corsair* was about to appear; and so highly did he rate Gifford's literary judgment that he declared: "I know no praise which would compensate me in my own mind for his censure." He gave practical proof of his sincerity by gratefully deferring to some strictures on portions of *Childe Harold*, made by Gifford in a friendly way, but which he assured his critic he would have obeyed

even were it conveyed in the less tender shape of the text of the Baviad, or a Monk Mason note in Massinger; I should have endeavoured to improve myself by your censure; judge then if I should be less willing to profit by your kindness.

Inasmuch as Byron represents the universal reaction of the nineteenth century against the ideas of the eighteenth, it will be seen that there were more differences than those "of years, morals, habits, and even politics," between the author of *Childe Harold* and the critic whose ideals were classical, and whose sympathies were Johnsonian. What they had in common, however, was a sincere admiration for the poetry of Pope, which, of course, Byron was unable to follow in practice; yet when he expressed his belief that the "little Queen Ann's man" was right, and that he and his contemporaries were upon a wrong revolutionary system, Gifford naturally was of opinion that he showed good sense and good judgment. If we remember that the reaction against the classicism of the eighteenth century was adumbrated in certain of Lamb's critical work, we can more easily understand Gifford, who was always *censor* rather than *vates*, in his capacity as editor, regarding some of his contributor's opinions as at variance with the doctrines which the *Quarterly Review* was bound to maintain, and, in consequence finding himself compelled to mutilate some of Lamb's finest prose. And when we reflect that it was Scott who gave enduring substance to the vision of

Romanticism it is curious to consider that the Review he originated was the consistent opponent of all that would

Its hope awaken and its spirit soar.

When this hostility to Romanticism is urged against Gifford, and also his insensibility to much of the beauty of the imaginative poetry of his time, many things have to be borne in mind. Heredity, breeding, natural power of intellect and character, count for much. Then it should also be remembered that when still very young he was brought into contact with the hard realities of life, "left a trampled orphan, and a selfish uncle's ward," and his artistic sense checked instead of being nourished in its growth. Meanness of origin, as we know, was a taunt often levelled against Horace, and although Gifford's father did not practise the self-denial which Horace tells us his father did to complete his education, the future critic was made of the stern stuff which triumphs over all obstacles, even those of humble birth, and although he had at one time to work out Algebraic problems with an awl on a piece of leather beaten thin, because he had neither ink, pen, nor paper, eventually he won for himself those educational advantages which only a University can bestow, and within the studious walls of Oxford, like Johnson half-a-century earlier, completed the studies begun in toil, and pursued through suffering and sorrow. *Is mihi videtur amplissimus qui sua virtute in altiore locum pervenit.*

The happy chance that brought him into intimate relation with Lord Grosvenor, and led to his becoming travelling tutor to his son, Lord Belgrave, thus enabling him to see other countries besides his own, gave that needed expansion to his mind which much close study is apt to retard. The avenue to profitable friendships thus opened was so well availed of by Gifford that he soon numbered amongst his warmest friends the leading spirits of the political and literary world. Their appreciation of his worth was substantial, and the official positions to which they helped him made his path in life easy so far as monetary matters were concerned.¹ His wholly delightful autobiography, in which he tells us all we need to know of his early days of hardship and struggle, brings us so near to him that we see the man beneath the critic, and learn to like him for his

¹ Those who estimate success in life by figures will be impressed by the fact that when he died he was worth £25,000.

manly character and sturdy honesty of purpose. Of himself he is engaging enough to tell us that Fortune assigned him—

One eye not over good,
Two sides that to their cost have stood
A ten years' hectic cough,
Aches, stitches, all the various ills
That swell the devilish doctor's bills,
And sweep poor mortals off.

But it is also true, and only just to own, that he had

A soul
That spurns the crowd's malign control,
A firm contempt of wrong ;
Spirits above affliction's power,
And skill to soothe the lingering hour
With no inglorious song.

With but little of the lyric gift, he yet acquired sufficient skill in turning verses which, without being ambitious, were not devoid of grace and tenderness. Those on the death of a faithful servant had a pathos that one would not suspect from the critic whose prose smote with such vigour the writers who had, as he conceived, mistaken letters for their vocation. As the sea of literature flows on to the ocean of oblivion, how many wrecked hopes and wasted lives are borne with it that might have been saved had salutary warning been sounded in time. Gifford spared no feelings in making it clear that the field of authorship must not be invaded by charlatans, that literature is a serious and an honourable calling not to be lightly entered upon, that equality in the republic of letters is attained by merit, and, it may be added, that if names are to be "writ in water," there is no need to cover reams of paper in doing so. *Quam quisque nōrit artem, in hāc se exercent.*

It was the gusto with which he did all this, the seeming joy in the *écreintement*, that led those who did not know him to believe that he was himself as savage as his sentences. Southey, however, while telling us that he had no literary sympathy with Gifford, adds: "He had a heart full of kindness for all living creatures except authors; *them* he regarded as a fishmonger regards eels, or as Izaak Walton did worms."

There is, of course, a pleasure in criticism which if too closely pursued may deprive us of the enjoyment of much that is excellent; but Gifford had set himself to crush the puerilities and sillinesses that the spread of literature in a nation seems

to engender. He was not concerned with the subtleties and nice disquisitions which delighted Jeffrey, who in his best efforts approached nearer to the finer literary criticism of our day. But, as Newman, in a well-known passage, says :

Every one is made for his day ; he does his work *in* his day ; what he does is not the work of any other day, but of his own day ; his work is necessary in order to the work of that next day which is not his.

The history of criticism, like the history of nations, is a record of mistakes. The perspicacity upon which we pique ourselves posterity may pronounce obtuseness. There can be no more finality in criticism than in creative effort. To judge according to our lights without fear or favour is to do the utmost that lies in our power : while the fearlessness that "spurns the world's malign control," and the justice that has a "firm contempt of wrong," are characteristics that one would like to find in those whose verdicts are destined to carry weight.

At all times fearless, it was when the disturbing element of politics entered in that Gifford became manifestly unfair in his utterances against those whose opinions were antagonistic to the Government. His loyalty to his friends at such times saw only the politician in the author, and party feeling affects our sensibility to more than literary merit. Nevertheless, although he could be exceedingly bitter, what Matthew Arnold said of his friend, Arthur Hugh Clough, can with equal truth be said of him : he never

traduced his friends, nor flattered his enemies, nor disparaged what he admired, nor praised what he despised. Those who knew him well had the conviction that, even with time, these literary arts would never be his.

It is no inconsiderable merit in one who for sixteen eventful years held the commanding position of editor of a powerful Review to deserve to have these words applied to him, and that the undeniable services he rendered to literature were recognized by his countrymen, as well as his "rare attainments and many excellent qualities," the honour accorded him of a tomb in Westminster Abbey is enduring evidence.

P. A. SILLARD.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

"Probabilism."

THE doctrine of Probabilism is very commonly supposed to be an invention of the much-contriving Jesuits, and to be based on a principle—or want of principle—so flagrantly immoral as to brand its authors as objects of detestation to all right-minded men.

Nor can it be doubted that were the doctrine in the least like what such critics assume it to be, it would most amply deserve their condemnation. The pity is that as a rule they have not thought it necessary to inquire from those who hold it what it is that they hold, but prefer to accept the account furnished by Pascal, taking for granted that the author of the *Provinciales*, because he was a brilliant writer, must needs be a safe authority as to the teaching of his antagonists.

What Probabilism "really means" we are told, for instance, by Dr. Littledale in his notorious article, "Jesuits," in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. It is, he says, "the substitution of external authority for the voice of conscience." In his *Plain Reasons* he explains the matter more fully :

The simple meaning of the principle called Probabilism, is [he writes] that if something be plainly forbidden by God's law of morals, and if you have a mind to do it, you may do it, in the teeth, not only of the Bible, but of most of the chief writers on morals, if only you can get the opinion of one casuistical writer in your favour, even though it be plainly weaker and less probable than that of those who bid you obey God's law.

The same appreciation of the incriminated doctrine is expressed with no less assurance by a writer of our own day whose position would seem amply to guarantee the trustworthiness of his utterances. In his *Birkbeck Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*, delivered some years ago in Trinity

College, Cambridge, and now published in book form¹ by the University Press, Mr. J. N. Figgis speaks thus :

Probabilism asserts that it is morally justifiable for a man to pursue the course which he believes to be wrong, if only he can find a single authority of weight who declares it to be right, *i.e.*, if Guy Fawkes thinks treason a sin he is yet justified in committing it and still retaining his opinion, if only he can quote Mariana, say, on the other side. It is clear that this theory is entirely destructive of all morality in a world where opinion is not unanimous, for it takes away that individual sense of responsibility for action which is its very basis.

This is quite in the Littledale vein. It must be added that it has nothing to do with the doctrine of Probabilism as understood by Probabilists.

That doctrine which, by the way, was certainly not of Jesuit invention, rests wholly on the maxim *Lex incerta non imponit obligationem certam*. If there be doubt as to a law, there can be no certainty as to the obligation which that law imposes : and if there be no certain obligation to the contrary, a man is at liberty to adopt a course against the rightness of which arguments and authorities may nevertheless be brought.

It is obviously required, that the doubt as to the law and its binding force must be *real*, that is to say, there must be sound reasons, not mere sophisms, in support of it. And, in the first place, such reasons must satisfy the conscience of the inquirer himself, for without this there can be neither probability nor possibility of his action being lawful. He must, that is to say, be fully convinced that he is free to act as he does. In cases such as Dr. Littledale imagines, where something is "plainly forbidden by God's law," in Scripture or otherwise, there can be no question, nor was ever supposed to be any, of finding a justification, and to represent Probabilism as having any connection with the like of these is monstrous. Murder, perjury, impurity, and calumny, are and must ever be simply bad, and no excuse can possibly be devised to cloak their iniquity.

But there must always remain a multitude of practical problems, as to which it is not so easy to decide. A law may be certain and obvious, and yet its application to a particular case by no means be so—more especially when it is a positive

¹ *From Gerson to Gratius, 1414—1625.*

law of human origin, like the Precepts of the Church. Murder is, no doubt, a crime, but *is it* murder for a soldier to kill an enemy in battle, when he knows little of the causes of the war, and so cannot decide as to its justice? Lying is forbidden by the Law of God, but *is it* a lie for a servant to say that his master is "not at home"? A Catholic is bound to hear Mass on Sunday, but does the obligation hold if the nearest church be five miles or ten miles away? To satisfy his conscience in such cases a man may either argue out the matter for himself, applying general principles of morality to the particular case in point; or he may consult the opinion of those who have made such subjects their special study, and decide according to their verdict. In the very common event of there being a difference of opinion amongst the doctors, some affirming and others denying the lawfulness of a certain course, and there being men of recognized authority upon either side, and force in the arguments they severally adduce, it is clear that neither opinion is so definitely proved as to be absolutely certain. Nor can it be said that to have recourse to the opinions of moralists is to substitute external authority for the voice of conscience; the very fact that authors of recognized standing and good repute in the Church adopt an opinion, is sufficient to show that it has arguments in its favour sufficient to convince men whose judgment is admitted to be worthy of consideration, and the arguments brought must be not merely counted but weighed. In the majority of instances it may even be said that this is the best and surest way in which to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. There are comparatively very few who are capable of arguing out for themselves the sort of questions of which we speak, or even of seriously attempting to do so. In common life, when in doubt upon matters of the kind, men consult their friends, although these may be no more capable of forming an opinion than their questioners. It seems a more common-sense plan to take counsel of those who have given their life to the study of such questions, and can have no personal consideration to warp their judgment.

If the opinions of moralists are found not to be unanimous upon any point, it naturally follows—as has been said—that neither opinion is so plainly wrong that a man can be compelled under pain of sin to renounce it and adopt the opposite. It should be remembered, though it is constantly forgotten, that the question is always in such cases, not what a man should

be recommended or exhorted to do, but to what a penitent can be obliged *sub gravi*, what a confessor has a right to demand of him as a condition for absolution. And if there be theologians of recognized authority for an opinion which the confessor himself does not share, it is held by Probabilists that he is not justified in treating the said opinion as untenable.

This holds good even though there be a majority of moralists on one side, for, provided that those of the minority be authors of acknowledged standing, their verdict is not convicted of error because they are fewer. When jurymen or judges differ about a case, it is not necessarily the larger number whose judgment is right.

As to the extreme case, which Mr. Figgis and others are wont to cite, of an opinion being held lawful though sustained only by one solitary authority, it is manifest that though but one be *known* as supporting a certain view, he may yet be such as to give assurance that the opinion he adopts is not a mere baseless individual whim. To know that St. Alphonsus, or St. Antoninus, or St. Thomas, or Cardinal de Lugo supports a certain view is sufficient to show that this is not ill-founded, and is not even confined to this one upholder.

But to suppose a case in which one solitary theologian, an *Athanasius contra mundum*, maintains an opinion which others unanimously condemn, and to say that, on the strength of this sole supporter, the view he champions becomes practically lawful, is ridiculous, as will speedily become evident if writers, instead of providing illustrations for themselves by means of their own imagination, will seek them in any Catholic manual of moral theology. They will not find it very easy to discover instances in which a merely probable opinion is declared to be tenable as against one more probable.

As for Mariana, had he said anything which could possibly justify the atrocious design of Guy Faukes, which is another question, it could certainly never be pretended that he is an "approved author," who could lend any weight to an opinion which he advocated.

J. G.

A Lover of Truth.

Dr. R. F. Horton seems never to be tired of telling the world how passionately he loves truth, and how repulsive to him is the lack of veracity, which he finds universal amongst Catholics.¹ In this he claims to represent the great characteristic of his countrymen, for are not Englishmen distinguished amongst all the nations of the earth by their scrupulous truthfulness, and do not even English schoolboys always feel bound to tell the truth as a matter of honour?

Although no others quite reach the high-water mark of this favoured nation, yet Protestants as a body, according to Dr. Horton, practise truthfulness as Catholics do not, and he tells us that when he searched the teachings of the latter he found to his astonishment, that these accurately corresponded to the results which became apparent when such people are dealt with, for, says he,

The great and broad distinction between Catholic and Protestant teaching is this, that while Protestant ethics insist on truth as a virtue of universal and absolute obligation, Catholic ethics or at least Catholic treatises on moral theology, are largely engaged in a casuistical discussion of the cases in which one is excused from telling the truth.

His point is further enforced by the story of a cousin of his own, who had originally been "a wholesome English boy, brought up in a Church of England home, with all the ordinary ideas which prevail among English schoolboys." Though not immaculate, he told the truth as a matter of honour, because the English standard demanded it.

Unfortunately, in some mysterious way, this youth was brought under the influence of the Dominican Fathers and became a Catholic, with the result that when Dr. Horton afterwards expressed proper Protestant abhorrence of what he considered duplicity and equivocation on the part of such a man as Cardinal Manning, his cousin, as the fruit of his new training, unhesitatingly replied—"Oh, but you *may* lie in the interest of religion."

That this sort of thing can be called convincing will hardly be pretended. It is, as we all know, an easy task to praise the Athenians at Athens, and anyone who impresses upon Englishmen the comfortable assurance that they are not as the rest of men, but of quite superior moral quality, is likely to enlist their

¹ See article, "Protestantism and Truth," in the *Sunday at Home*, May, 1907.

sympathies on his side. Neither do we learn very much from general denunciations of the teaching of Catholic moralists: it would be more instructive were we told in what this differs, in regard of the point in question, from that of sturdy Englishmen and Protestants such as Jeremy Taylor, Milton, Paley, Dr. Johnson, Mr. Froude, and Professor Henry Sidgwick, whose doctrine on the subject is as like that of Catholic casuists as six to half a dozen. As to the case of the young convert, if he really said what is imputed to him, or anything like it, he must have been an exceptionally ignorant and ill-instructed specimen, for the principle which he is represented as having laid down is the very opposite of what Catholics unanimously teach.

To attempt to follow such a controversialist into this jungle of irresponsible statements would be a hopeless enterprise. It will be more profitable to consider an instance in which Dr. Horton has practically exemplified his burning love of truth, and of which—strange to say—he appears to be not a little proud, at least when the telling of the tale is left to himself.

In the spring of 1905 Dr. Horton was challenged to prove the assertion he had made, that as a main point of Catholic teaching priests have the power of making God or "creating their Creator," that this doctrine is laid down "in manuals of Catholic theology," and that "on this claim, combined with the confessional and the power to liberate souls from Purgatory, rests the ghostly power of the priesthood."

In reply to this challenge, in the columns of the *Manchester Guardian*, Dr. Horton produced from various obscure corners of history, of which not one Catholic in a thousand has ever heard, a few utterances of preachers or writers who had used the expression that the priest in the Mass may be styled in a sense the "creator of his Creator." One of these was Pope Urban II. in the eleventh century, another Gabriel Biel in the fifteenth, a third St. Alphonsus de Liguori in the eighteenth. In reply it was pointed out that, even were all these instances genuine and indisputable, they would be far from justifying the assertion that this is a main point of Catholic doctrine, to be found in our manuals of theology. Moreover, that the authenticity of Pope Urban's words is not beyond suspicion, and that in any case both his and those of St. Alphonsus are not used doctrinally but rhetorically, in an exhortation to priests to

venerate and esteem their high office, and in a context which precludes the monstrous and nonsensical meaning which Dr. Horton would give them, as if a mortal man were supposed to have the power of calling God into existence. As to Gabriel Biel, Dr. Horton knew so little about him as to term him "a distinguished Cardinal," whereas he was not a Cardinal at all, and had evidently got his information second-hand from a very untrustworthy source — Edgar — omitting important qualifications found in the original, and mistranslating a simple Latin phrase so as to give it a sense which it cannot properly bear.

Meanwhile, it was asked, if Dr. Horton really desired to ascertain what Catholics teach and believe, why, instead of these remote nooks and crannies, did he not betake himself to the quarters where means of instruction are expressly provided? There is, for instance, the Council of Trent, which alike in the Decrees which it issued, and in the Catechism drawn up under its authority for use by parish priests, roundly condemns the notion which, according to Dr. Horton, is sedulously impressed upon Catholics for the glorification of the priesthood, and to make its poor dupes believe that it possesses powers which are not only incredible but inconceivable. To exactly the same effect is the teaching of the Catechisms used in these islands. Why, it was asked, if truth were the object was nothing said of these? How did Dr. Horton explain so remarkable an omission? He took the simpler and safer plan of not explaining it at all, sternly ignoring such inconvenient questions. And now we find him coming forward before another audience, which has no means of knowing the facts, and perhaps no great desire, with an account of the famous victory he gained on that occasion, strutting and crowing, boasting how he demolished a man in buckram, and lashing himself into a fury of virtuous indignation over such outrages against the sacred cause of truth as his adversaries perpetrated.

In my experience [he declares] they [Catholic controversialists] are all alike. They loudly deny until they are confuted, and then slink into unmanly silence. Their one method is to libel and vilify the person who ventures to tell the truth about their Church. They cannot use the rack and the stake, but the spirit is the same, and the method is as malicious and deadly as Bonner's or Torquemada's.

What would such a writer not say if he could have a Catholic Dr. Horton to deal with?

J. G.

Reviews.

I.—THE BLIND SISTERS OF ST. PAUL.¹

THIS is quite an unusual book. Indeed, we may perhaps be allowed to say that it is acceptable almost in the measure of its departure from the conventional type of such pious literature. That it is perfect either in style or construction we should not quite venture to maintain. There are possibly a certain number of readers who will be rather bored by M. de Sizeranne's elaborate analysis of a blind man's sensations, and the knowledge that he is the author of two other books, *Impressions et Souvenirs d'un Aveugle* and *Les Aveugles par un Aveugle*, may help to create an impression that he finds a certain amount of gusto in exploiting his experience of this overwhelming affliction. But the book is a living book, and the writer's mind is of that rare order which can stand the test of being laid bare even to impertinent inspection. Quotations from Tolstoi, Michelet, d'Annunzio, Ruskin, Pierre Loti, Victor Hugo, Henri Perreyve, Dickens, &c., would also show him to be sufficiently catholic in his literary tastes. Apart from its introductory portions, the volume is taken up with a description of the origin, organization, and history of the Institute of the Blind Sisters of St. Paul. There is certainly a very remarkable charm about the account given of this novel type of community devoted to the instruction of the blind, and consisting of members a considerable proportion of whom are themselves sightless. At one moment the author introduces us to the most minute details of the brush-making industry, at another he tells us about knitting, or about the Braille type; then in the next paragraph he turns with perfect naturalness to some deep and very true reflection upon the spiritual side of life, and again, without perceptible effort, he varies this from time to time with an apt quotation or a vivid piece of description. Upon one point we venture to say every reader will be agreed. M. de Sizeranne has been extraordinarily fortunate in his

¹ *The Blind Sisters of St. Paul.* By Maurice de la Sizeranne. Authorized Translation by L. M. Leggatt. London: Kegan Paul, 1907.

translator. The book bristles with difficulties and with pitfalls for the unwary. But Mrs. Leggatt has produced a version which few who casually took up the book would suspect to be anything but an original work, and even at that the work of an author with an exceptional gift of apt expression. We cannot conclude without at least making one extract almost at random. Here, in a letter, is the description of a winter's day:

The hard snow crackles under our feet. How much I prefer such a carpet to the dust of summer! "All the country is white and evenly covered," says my father, "only the trees stand out boldly." He looks and I listen. What peace, what absolute stillness everywhere! All life seems to have ceased. But no; now and then out of this universal silence come sounds of living things. A wood-pecker skims through the air giving his metallic note. In the distance crows are sending up hoarse and imperious cries of hunger. Here, close to the road, snow is falling from the branches of a tree, and a little further off a brook is running with its bright, clear music. If it were a solemn poetical stream it would be silent; no poet has ever yet consented to let a brooklet babble in the death-like winter. But this tiny rill takes little heed of these immemorial rules; it goes hurrying on with the greatest animation, as if to live and speak for all the voiceless objects on its banks.

This strikes us as excellent. So also is the typography of the volume, which has been executed, we note, at the Arden Press.

2.—ABYSSINIA IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.¹

The interest of the people of this country has of late years been frequently centred in the mysterious regions of central Africa. There have been wars, expeditions, and "incidents," at Fashoda, in Somaliland, and on the Upper Nile. A great deal has depended on the right understanding and good management of affairs in those far-distant countries, and as the Cape to Cairo railway progresses, the importance of those regions will rather wax than wane.

Under these circumstances Father Beccari's publication of Father d'Almeida's *Historia de Ethiopia*, from the unique manuscript in the British Museum, is a work of some importance. Father Manuel d'Almeida was an active missionary in Africa and India for close on fifty years (1601 to 1649), and the years

¹ *Rerum Aethiopicarum Scriptores*. Vol. V. P. Em. d'Almeida, S.J., *Historia Aethiopiae*, Libri I.—IV. Curante C. Beccari, S.J. Romae: Luigi. 1907.

of his greatest vigour were spent in Abyssinia and in the Nile valley. In this history he gives an elaborate account of the country and of his experiences in it, and those of his Jesuit *confrères*. Needless to say, his work contains much that is instructive, valuable, and edifying, as well as plenty that is curious. Father Beccari's scholarly Introduction summarizes the extant correspondence of the missionaries, and very interesting reading it makes. The volume is adorned by a good photographic reproduction of a contemporary map. We are glad to hear that the Italian Government has given assistance to this publication.

3.—WESTMINSTER LECTURES.¹

The Third Series of *Westminster Lectures* is quite up to the standard set by the two which preceded it. Father Sharpe leads off with *Authority in Belief*, calling attention to the indispensable part it plays in human life generally, its necessity in a religion based on revelation, and the just limits, in no way infringing on Liberty of Conscience or any other reasonable liberty, within which it is exercised in the Catholic Church. It is a thoughtful essay, though perhaps a little too difficult in its style to suit the needs of more than the well-educated few. Dr. McIntyre writes on *Revelation and Creeds*, and explains that his purpose is not to set forth the converging lines of proof for the genuine form of the Christian Revelation, but "to remove, or rather to lessen, an antecedent perplexity of mind, which too often prevents one from even wishing to give them serious attention," the perplexity, namely, "which has been created by the existence of so many creeds and sects." In *The Church versus Science* Father Gerard pursues his favourite theme, and shows by a study of the few examples to which appeal can be plausibly made, how unfounded is the charge that the Church sets herself against science. The interesting facts he brings together about the way in which Copernicus, Kepler, Gassendi, and even Galileo were treated by the ecclesiastics of their time will be new to many readers, as will be also the views on the subject expressed by such writers as Whewell, Brewster, De Morgan, and Huxley. In *Theories of the Transmigration of Souls*, Dr. Gibbons examines these

¹ *Westminster Lectures*. Third Series. Edited by the Rev. Francis Aveling, D.D. London and Edinburgh: Sands and Co.

theories as alternatives alleged to explain more satisfactorily than Christianity the problem of sin and suffering. In *Mysticism* Father R. H. Benson discusses an abstruse and difficult subject, that special intuition into Divine things which is found in certain of the saints. Perhaps he does not make sufficient allowance for the supernatural character of this insight, but he writes with his usual originality, and is helpful in his co-ordination of the kindred facts. Dr. Poock's *Socialism and Individualism* will not be pleasing to Socialists, who are sure to say that it misstates their case. But this it certainly does not, for whilst cordially acknowledging the many evils which need to be remedied in our present system, it sets forth in a clear and effective manner the far greater evils which must follow should a purely socialistic system come into force. Those particularly should weigh his arguments who imagine it would be possible to find a place in such a system for Catholic life, or worship, or morality.

4.—HOME FOR GOOD.¹

Mother Mary Loyola is unwearied in providing the very practical species of instruction which in so special a manner she has made her own. In this her latest volume she addresses herself to supply what all who have practical experience must recognize as a great and urgent need. Young persons, youths and maidens alike, who finish their school course, and are not forced of necessity to betake themselves to some definite professional or business occupation, whose lot it is simply to live at home, are apt to regard such an existence as simply an indefinite extension of the holidays or "vacations" to which they have hitherto been accustomed, and so to settle down to a mere aimless pursuit of pleasure and amusement, which, if once adopted as a rule of life, will make it very difficult for them ever to become what they ought to be—strenuous workers in the cause to which all Catholics are called to devote themselves. For, as Mother Loyola says,

A vocation is not merely for priests and those who take the vows of Religion. Vocation means "call," and there is such a call for each one of us. Work for the service of God which is to win us our crown in Heaven, means any good work done for His sake, and there is plenty waiting to be done on every side.

¹ *Home for Good.* By Mother Mary Loyola, of the Bar Convent, York. Edited, with a Preface, by Father Thurston, S.J. Pp. xii. and 326. 3s. 6d. net. London: Burns and Oates. 1907.

The author consequently sketches, largely in a series of imaginary conversations, the sort of work which should be done by boys or girls—but chiefly, as is natural, by girls—whether for their own improvement, mental and spiritual ;—or in social work for the benefit of others. It need not be added that in her hands the old substantial truths which have ever been the burden of Catholic instruction, run no danger of seeming trite or hackneyed, but in the ingenious setting which she knows how to give them become thoroughly “up-to-date.” She can even press into the service the extraordinary and abnormal desert growth known as *Welwitschia mirabilis*, to be seen at Kew, as an illustration of what will become of the soul that is allowed to develop itself on one side only. In like manner the telephone is made to convey a useful lesson, and science in various branches is made to bear fruit which is not the less solid because it is quite different from what those who call themselves “scientists” associate with its name.

We trust that Mother Loyola may long be spared us to carry on her admirable work.

5.—THE PHILOSOPHERS OF THE SMOKING-ROOM.¹

In *The Philosophers of the Smoking-Room*, Dr. Aveling uses the dialogue form to discuss some fundamental aspects of the religious question. A Priest, a Parson, a Poet, a Doctor, the Poet's wife, and the Parson's daughter, are brought together by the accident of being fellow-passengers on a liner bound for Canada. Each has his own mental temperament and standpoint. The lady, an unbeliever and a spiritualist, is an aggressive specimen of feminine dogmatism ; the girl stands for the ready responsiveness to truth of a simple and untainted heart, the Poet for the æsthetic and emotional attraction for religion which apes but is so different from real religious feeling, the Doctor for the scientific spirit of the age, the Parson for the unconscious but cultivated inconsequence which characterizes one type of that cloth in its defence of its positions, whilst the Priest, of course, represents the Catholic Church and its reasons for the faith to which it bears witness. The mention of a recent suicide serves to start them, and from that moment they never meet during the voyage without continuing the conversations.

¹ *The Philosophers of the Smoking-Room.* Conversations on some matters of moment. By Francis Aveling, D.D. London : Sands and Co.

The mystery of human suffering, the existence of the Soul, the existence of God, the ethics of fishing, death-beds, atoms and molecules, myths, spiritualism, are discussed in turn. Probably the author will be criticized for his attempt to unite in one two such incompatibles as a good conversation and an argumentative exposition, and will be reminded that it is of the essence of the former not to be too systematic or conclusive, but of the latter to abound in both these qualities. For our own part we have never been able to see the justice of this criticism which is so regularly passed on expositions in the form of dialogues. Granted that the dialogue suffers somewhat in its artistic quality by being subordinated to the necessities of an argument, that is surely no reason why the exponent of an argument should be forbidden a method so well adapted to his purpose. At the same time, in the present instance, Dr. Aveling may fairly claim that he has not been neglectful of the features requisite in a good dialogue. The priest is too didactic, no doubt, and his paragraphs are frequently too long and abstruse to be digested in the brief spaces of a conversation; besides, he poses and is accepted far too much as the Mentor of the party. Still, the characters live fairly well, the conclusions are not driven too far home, nor is the inevitable discursiveness of conversations excluded. And, on the other hand, the author has shown considerable skill in constructing his explanations, which are neatly and clearly, and often strikingly stated, and can be of use to such as may be induced to bestow upon them the reflection they deserve. One point at least the discussions of these philosophers should serve to enforce, and he would seem from the following passage to have had it specially in view:

"What a curious difference there is," began the Doctor, . . .
"between our friends the Parson and the Priest. . . ."

"Yes," said the Poet, "but it is a difference one always observes between the Roman Catholic clergy and those of our own Church. The former always seem to me a little inhuman. Perhaps it comes from their way of looking at things from a cut and dried standpoint. They always seem to be weighing pros and cons of things, balancing probabilities if they are moralists, and smelling out flaws in syllogisms if they happen to be disposed to dogma. Some will reel out an endless string of authorities in support of their assertions; others are not satisfied until they have twisted their thoughts out of human shape to speak in the chaff-chopping of logic."

"Well, that's not so bad a fault, after all. . . . I'm thinking it's

rather to the credit than the debit side of their character to be, or to try to be accurate. I would rather be a logic-chopper myself than resemble many a parson I know, who can never give any good reason for what he thinks or says or preaches. If a man hits me fair and square between the eyes with a fact, I believe him. Or if he can prove that he is right, I'm ready to follow his lead. But if he's a sentimental sort of chap, who tries to force his opinions, or what he calls his opinions down my throat, I want a reason. . . ."

"Now that's just where the beauty of the Catholics comes in. They give you facts and reasons—pretty good reasons too, most of them. The ordinary psalm-singer tells you to believe and you'll be saved. Believe what? He doesn't know, or, if he does, the next one you meet will tell you something else. Why even our good friend, the Parson, gets up a tree, like a 'possum, whenever an argument drops on the table. But the Priest meets it, or does his best to. Anyway he gives you the credit of being in earnest, and walks into your theories as if he meant business."

6.—LE GRAMMAIRE DE L'ASSENTIMENT.¹

Interest in Cardinal Newman as a religious thinker has recently been awakened among a section of French Catholics, and what is called the New Apologetic claims, rightly or wrongly, to be based on his philosophical opinions. Hence the demand for a French translation of his chief philosophical work, which Madame Gaston Paris undertook to supply, and has now completed. If it should be found defective in some respects one ought not to be too severe in judging it, reflecting, as an Englishman must, that to translate Newman into another language is about as hard a literary task as any one could attempt. It is just, too, to say that this *Grammaire de l'Assentiment* reads well, and gives on the whole a fairly accurate rendering of Newman's reasonings. Still, one could wish that, in dealing with such a master of subtle thought and exact style, the translator had imposed on herself the obligation to adhere more rigidly to his text.

Sometimes clauses are omitted, as on page 288, where, in the clause "nous supplementons toujours la logique verbale par la logique de la pensée," the explanatory adjectives, "the more subtle and elastic" (logic of thought), are wanting; and in the next clause where Newman observes that the Illative Sense

¹ *Etudes de Philosophie et de Critique religieuse.* Newman. *Grammaire de l'Assentiment.* Ouvrage traduit de l'Anglais par Madame Gaston Paris. Paris: Librairie Bloud et Cie.

may be possessed by a given individual "in one department of thought, for instance, history, and not in another, for instance, philosophy," the alternative instance, "philosophy," is not given; whilst in the next paragraph, where it is said that this same Sense "in coming to its conclusion proceeds always in the same way, by a method of reasoning which . . . is the elementary principle of that mathematical *calculus* of modern times which has so wonderfully extended the limits of abstract science," we have the mutilated and vapid rendering, "Pour la methode, je l'ai comparée à cette methode mathematique, des limites, qui a rendu de si grands services."

Sometimes the sense is missed, to the distraction and perplexity of the reader. On page 224 the section on Formal Inference is reached, in which Newman says, "now I come to the second reason why (the) conclusions (of Formal Inference) are thus wanting in precision." This is rendered, "J'arrive à mon second point qui est de démontrer que les conclusions du raisonnement logique manquent de précision." And presently the observation that "we reason in order to enlarge our knowledge of matters which do not depend on us for being what they are," becomes the mysterious reflection that "si nous raisonnons, c'est pour élargir le cercle de nos connaissances matérielles," &c. Also on page 89, where Newman distinguishes in the "feeling of conscience" a twofold element in that "it is a moral sense and a sense of duty, a judgment of the reason and a magisterial dictate," the translator shows that she has missed the whole point of the distinction by her confused rendering, "C'est une émotion morale, le sentiment du devoir, et c'est un acte raisonnable, un jugement, un arrêt impérieux:" in keeping with which misconception we find her shortly after making an important statement quite unintelligible. It is where Newman, insisting on the second of the two elements, the sense of duty or obligation, and remarking that it is the primary and best known element in conscience, says, "Half the world would be puzzled to know what was meant by the moral sense, but every one knows what is meant by a good or bad conscience." And Madame Paris renders, "Que de gens se trouveraient embarrassés, s'il leur fallait expliquer ce qu'on entend par obligation morale; au contraire, tout le monde sait ce qu'on entend par avoir une bonne au mauvaise conscience."

These are a few instances out of many similar. A still more serious defect is the translator's dealing with the doubtless

difficult question of technical terminology. But if it is advisable to translate Newman into French, it is surely advisable to keep the terminology which he himself selected as the necessary condition of making his meaning clear and precise: nor should the genius of the French language be pleaded as rendering this rule impracticable. To pass over "assentiment," which the translator acknowledges to be a not very satisfactory rendering of "assent," why must we have such strange expressions as "le sens des inférences" rather than "le sens illatif," and "l'assentiment de notion" rather than "l'assentiment notionnel"? And throughout the book why such shying at the word "notion," for which frequently the indeterminate word "idée" is substituted, when Newman's entire argument turns on the distinction drawn between "notions" or "notional ideas" and "real ideas"?

Short Notices.

MAJOR TURTON is to be congratulated on the appearance of a sixth edition (twelfth thousand) of his popular defence of the Christian Faith, entitled *The Truth of Christianity* (Wells, Gardner, Darton, and Co.). We reviewed the book at length on the appearance of the fourth edition five years ago, and need only say here that the author has devoted considerable pains to developing and perfecting his argument, and at the same time has reduced the price of his book to 2s. 6d. It forms an excellent counter-blast to the productions of the Rationalistic Press, being written in clear and intelligible English, and logically arranged. We trust that the gallant Major, who has been as effective in fighting for his country as for his faith, may one day add to some future edition of his essay a chapter showing with equal cogency that Catholicism is the only true form of Christianity. *Talis cum sis, utinam esses noster.*

Messrs. Gill and Son, of Dublin, have issued in a shilling unbound volume the *Poetical Works of "Speranza,"* the gifted poetess of the *Nation* newspaper, in the years before the great famine. "Speranza" was the pen-name of Lady Wilde, the wife of the distinguished Irish surgeon, Sir William Wilde, and her stirring verses had considerable influence in fanning the flame of nationality that fired the "Young Ireland" movement. She wrote, however, nothing that still lives on the lips of her

countrymen, like some of the songs of Davis and Mangan, her contemporaries, and, though a woman of wide culture, as her translations from various European languages testify, she lacked the essential note of genius.

Father Northcote, O.S.M., has made a useful contribution to ascetical literature in publishing his treatise on divine charity, *The Bond of Perfection* (Burns and Oates). He develops his theme by explaining, as far as it can be explained, the mystery of grace, making a distinction, which all theologians would not grant him, between that supernatural quality and charity itself, and leading his readers farther than some will be ready to follow him into the metaphysics of the subject. However, when theory is laid aside and we come to practice there is much profit to be found in this little book for souls seeking perfection, for the author discusses not only the fruits of charity, patience, kindness, and the like, but also the vices that chiefly oppose it.

In the *Selected Poetry of Father Faber* (Washbourne), a volume beautiful alike in substance and form—Father John Fitzpatrick, O.M.I., has completed his labours for the memory of the great Oratorian, and produced a fitting complement to the *Characteristics from the Writings of Father Faber*, issued some years ago. Faber's poetry, both Anglican and Catholic, fills three fairly large volumes, and Father Fitzpatrick has had to be somewhat severe to bring his selections within the compass of a small quarto of 200 pages. As a result, however, we have the essence of a truly poetic spirit, expressing itself in language that is always melodious and often inspired.

Father Faber also is the author of another little volume, published by Messrs. Washbourne, which is called *St. Joseph: Leaves from Father Faber*, and which is formed of extracts from his writings collected and arranged by the Hon. Alison Stourton. *Bethlehem* and *The Foot of the Cross* are the books chiefly drawn from, and a bright and devotional picture of the great Saint is presented in Faber's gorgeous prose.

We are glad to welcome another *Story of our Lord for Children* (Sealey, Bryers, and Walker), in addition to those by Mother Loyola, the late Mr. Costelloe, Mrs. Percy Dearmer, and others. This latest volume is from the gifted pen of Katherine Tynan (Mrs. Hinkson), who keeps strictly to the Gospel narrative, and uses its sublime and simple words wherever possible. It should not now be difficult, with this

abundant choice of excellent books, to make the young generation familiar with "those stainless years that breathed beneath the Syrian blue."

The Mass Companion, by the Very Rev. Dom Alphonsus Morrall, O.S.B. (Art and Book Company), has been produced with a double object, first, to increase the devotion of the faithful to the Holy Sacrifice by providing an explanation of the liturgy and suggesting suitable prayers, and secondly, to supply a guide for non-Catholics to the whole ceremonial of the Mass. For these purposes, "Devotions," "Notes," the Latin words of the service, and a translation are printed in four parallel columns on each double page. The only drawback to this excellent arrangement is the probability that the worshipper may be tempted to read the interesting "Notes" at a time when he would be better occupied with the "Devotions."

In reading *Some Characteristics from the Life of Father Paul of Moll*, translated from the French by Dom P. Nolan, we might suppose ourselves transported back into the Middle Ages, for after a short biography of the priest in question, the rest of the volume is devoted to a record of the wonders wrought by his hands or through his intercession, a hundredth part of which, if duly authenticated, ought, one would think, to secure his beatification. Father Paul was a native of Belgium, who died in 1896, the diocese of Bruges being the principal scene of his labours. Unfortunately the whole truth is not told us here. We feel sure that neither the translator of the book, nor its English publishers, can be aware that the clergy of Bruges have retained a very different impression of Father Paul from that presented in this volume, and that the Bishop emphatically refused it his *imprimatur*. Its publication in another and distant diocese has in fact been the occasion of not a little scandal. The printing and general get-up of this little book are as unsatisfactory as its subject. Its foreign type is unpleasing and it is disfigured by innumerable mis-spellings.

A very edifying biography and pleasantly written is *The Life of Madame Lummis*, by Delia Gleeson (Burns and Oates). Rose Lummis was an American girl, born of wealthy Protestant parents in the year 1844. She became converted in 1862 through the example of a young relative, who told her of his intention to enter Religion. Circumstances, however, prevented her being actually received till 1865. Debarred by infirm health from becoming a nun, she led a life of self-devotion in

the world, wholly given up to the service of the poor and ignorant. The chief scene of her labours was the little Canadian town of Simcoe, near Lake Erie, but her apostolic spirit influenced all with whom she came into contact. She closed a life of great holiness on March 26, 1900.

Under the title, *The Incarnation and Life of our Lord* (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co.), Dom Vincent Scully, C.R.L., issues a translation of a series of Sermons on our Lord's Life and Passion by the venerable author of the *Imitation*. The translation follows the critical text of the *Opera Omnia*, now being edited by Dr. Pohl, of Bonn, and forms the second of seven volumes, in which it is proposed to include all the extant works of à Kempis, with the exception of the *Imitation*. The sermons, which resemble rather meditations than set discourses, are full of unction and eloquence, and form a sort of commentary by the author himself of the sublime teaching of the more famous work.

Long experience of the requirements of examiners has made the editors of the University Tutorial Series adepts in the preparation of Text Books for various examinations. *A Preliminary Course of Experimental Science* (W. B. Clive) is written to meet the syllabus of the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland, and is a model of well-arranged and clearly presented information on the elements of Physics and Chemistry, plentifully illustrated and equipped with test-questions.

Magazines.

Some contents of foreign Periodicals :

ANALECTA BOLLANDIANA. (1907, II. and III.)

The Saints of Cyprus, Unprinted Texts. *H. Delehaye*. The Death of Pope St. Leo IX. *A. Poncelet*. The *Vita Prima* of Urban V. *E. Hocedez*. Record of Hagiographical Publications and Catalogue of the Latin Lives of Saints in the manuscripts of Roman libraries.

RASSEGNA GREGORIANA. (July, August, 1907.)

Notes upon the Kyrie "Alme Pater." *A. Mocquereau*. The sincope and the accompaniment of Gregorian Chant. *G. Bas*. The Fifteenth Centenary of St. John Chrysostome. Notes, Reviews, and Bibliography.

ÉTUDES. (July 20 and August 5.)

The "Sin" of the Missionaries, the Question of a Native Clergy. *A. Brou.* Patriotism among the Greeks. *André Bremond.* The Jewish Religious Crisis. *P. Bernard.* Episcopal Resignations in the Year X. *P. Dudon.* Art and Archæology—the Basilica of Fourvières. *S.M. Perrin.* The New Philosophy and its Conception of Truth. *J. de Tonquédec.* Christian Tradition and its Relation to History. *A. d'Alès.* Religious Evolution and the Decree of the Holy Office. *E. Portalis.* Aeronautics. *H. Dugout.* Reviews, &c.

STIMMEN AUS MARIA LAACH. (August 7, 1907.)

The New Syllabus of the Holy Office; What the present emergency requires. Upon the Steep Slope of Idealism. *J. Fröbes.* Religion and Pædagogy. *V. Cathrein.* The Criteria of Social Well-being. *H. Pesch.* From Rome to Pompei. *J. Hagen.* Reviews, &c.

LA CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA. (August 3 and 17.)

The recent Syllabus. A Victim of Byzantine Despotism—Pope St. Martin I. What is Genius?—à propos of a recent definition. Pelt's *History of the Old Testament.* Sardinia in the light of recent measures. Manichæism and the Law of the ancient Empire. The Heads of the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul. The Jesuits in North America.

STUDIEN UND MITTHEILUNGEN. (1907, II.)

The Life of St. Romanus Dryensis. *B. Adlhoeh.* On the *Peculium* of Religious. *L. Kober.* The Historical Work of Father Gams. *F. Leichert.* St. Bernard of Clairvaux. *A. Steiger.* Cardinal Pitra. *P. Bühler.*

REVUE PRATIQUE D'APOLOGÉTIQUE. (August 1 and 15.)

The Bearing of the New Syllabus. *A. Baudrillart.* The Great Schism of the West and the difficulties suggested by it. *L. Salembier.* The Question of Martyrdom. *L. Rivière.* A Scientific Morality. *J. Cartier.* The steady increase of Juvenile Criminality. *F. Gibon.* Reviews, &c.

RAZÓN Y FÉ (August, 1907.)

Mediaeval Obscurantism. *R. Ruiz Amado.* The Christ of the Synoptics and of the Fourth Gospel. *L. Murillo.* A Great Artist, Saj. Lope de Vega, Priest and Poet. *J.M. Alcarado.* A new theory about the Origin of Life. *J. Puilhula.* Reviews, &c.

